



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2023

No. 31

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, February 17, 2023, at 10 a.m.

## Senate

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2023

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O God, source of knowledge and wisdom, give us Your truth. Open our eyes to see Your truth. Strengthen our hearts to face Your truth. Illuminate our spirits to understand Your truth. Fortify our minds that we will remember Your truth.

Give Your Senators today the determination to obey Your truth. Show them what to believe and what to do.

Lord, help us all to listen carefully to Your wise counsel and store up knowledge that transforms lives.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, February 15, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

### TRIBUTE TO DIANNE FEINSTEIN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday, our wonderful colleague from California, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, announced that she will retire at the end of her term.

I am careful not to throw the word “legend” around too often in this Chamber, as it truly befits so few, but DIANNE FEINSTEIN is precisely that. She is a legend.

She is a legend in California, where she shattered innumerable glass ceilings as the first woman Senator from the State. And we forget how, even 20,

30 years ago, the barriers which are still in front of women were even stronger, so it took a strong, tough, resolute woman to break them, and she did.

She is a legend here in the Senate. The longest serving woman Senator in U.S. history, she built a reputation as an expert legislator and a leader on so many issues—gun violence, the environment, women’s rights, and so much more.

I first got to know DIANNE when she led the effort to pass the 1994 ban on assault weapons in the Senate. I led it in the House. I have always been amazed by the sheer depth of her knowledge on the issues and how careful she is about learning all of the facts before she goes forward and then her seemingly innate ability to convince people on both sides of the aisle to work together. That is why her list of accomplishments is so long—the assault weapons ban, protecting oversight authority during the investigation into U.S. torture, championing the Violence Against Women Act. The list goes on and on and on.

But perhaps her greatest legacy is how she blazed a trail for women and girls everywhere. Today, there are 25 women serving in this Chamber. There are 25 women serving in this Chamber, all of whom stand on DIANNE’s shoulders.

We are all very glad we have another year and a half with her to fight the good fight, and I know she will use that time to fiercely advocate for women’s rights in all aspects of life and unwaveringly represent the people of California.

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S405

## DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on implementation, as President Biden pointed out last week during his State of the Union Address, the Democratic agenda is already bearing fruit across this country. There will be tens of thousands of projects funded. Last week, for instance, I joined with President Biden to talk about Gateway in New York, which is something New Yorkers have waited for for decades and is vital to continuing the health of our bistate—New York-New Jersey—economy as well as the economy of the Northeast.

When the President came and we actually started working on the project, you could feel exaltation and excitement in the city. That is going to start happening again and again everywhere—in urban, suburban, and rural areas—as Democrats make it a priority to get the word out about all the good things that are coming the American people's way. It is one thing for Americans to read about things that Congress has passed, but when they can actually feel and see these accomplishments play out in their communities, it makes a world of difference. We have a responsibility to make the connection between what happens in this Chamber and what is going on in people's backyards.

This morning, I sent out a Dear Colleague with Senator STABENOW about how Democrats are going to get the word out on implementing our agenda in the coming weeks. We have a great story to tell the American people and no shortage of examples of how our agenda is making the country stronger and making Americans' lives better.

Let me give a few examples: Seniors on Medicare, for instance, can now, already, take advantage of Democrats' historic \$35-a-month cap on insulin. After years of hard work, this is no longer an aspiration; a \$35 insulin cap is now the law of the land. Seniors, who were up nights worrying how they were going to pay \$400, \$500, \$600, \$700 a month for this vital drug when you have diabetes can now breathe easy. Millions of people—the seniors and their families and friends—can breathe easier because of what we have done.

Now—let's not forget—we should be expanding the cap to all Americans, not just to those over 65. And in this Congress, Democrats are going to work hard, try to work with our Republican colleagues—we hope they will join us—to make that happen.

Here is another one: Very few people know of this, but we are spreading the word. Seniors on Medicaid can take advantage of free shingles vaccines. These two benefits alone—the insulin cap and free shingles vaccines—could mean hundreds in savings every year for seniors on Medicaid. And so many seniors are.

On the infrastructure fund: Communities across the country can now apply for new grant funding to fix their roads, their bridges, their highways.

These are perhaps the most obvious examples of our agenda at work. People are going to start seeing more orange vests, more hardhats, and good-paying union jobs in their communities as the communities get the updates they sorely need.

And the Inflation Reduction Act is already doing exactly what its name suggests: saving people money. The tax credits alone can give families as much as \$14,000 for making their homes energy efficient. People can put in heat pumps, get help to get those heat pumps, and their heating bills go down. It is a great thing.

The examples go on. Democrats are going to make implementation a top priority in this Congress. After everything we have been through over the past 3 years, Americans deserve to hear some good news about how their leaders are working hard for them. That is precisely what we will focus on in the coming years.

## DEBT CEILING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, chaos over there in the House on the Republican side. Each day that passes in Washington, two things hold true: We keep getting closer to default but no closer to a Republican plan to lift the debt ceiling. I repeat once again: House Republicans, Speaker MCCARTHY, show us your plan. It has been more than a month since Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans began threatening the entire U.S. economy in order to secure drastic spending cuts that, in all likelihood, will hurt the American people badly. But in all this time, nobody can seem to get an answer to the \$64,000 question: What cuts exactly are the Republicans proposing? Show us your plan.

Some of the things we are hearing from the MAGA wing is the stuff of nightmares. Later this afternoon, I will join with a number of Senate colleagues to shine a light on how devastating the radical MAGA cuts would be for American families if the MAGA Republicans got their way.

But where is the House Republican plan? How are they going to lift the debt ceiling? After months of no answers, now Speaker MCCARTHY has recently claimed Republican leadership is trying to come up with a plan right now. I am glad he is at least saying he wants to answer our question.

Frankly, it is a lot easier said than done, and I don't think Speaker MCCARTHY will be able to unify his conference. It takes 218 votes, as we know, to pass anything in the House, and with the razor-thin GOP majority paralyzed by internal division and with the stronghold the MAGA Republicans have on the Speaker, Speaker MCCARTHY will have a very difficult time getting everyone on the same page, if he can do it at all.

To quote from Punchbowl this morning, "House Republicans . . . face an intractable political math challenge as

they seek to reduce the \$1.4 trillion deficit." For one, Speaker MCCARTHY has insisted Republicans will only preserve the full faith and credit of the United States if they secure drastic spending cuts first.

MAGA Republican hardliners have demanded Speaker MCCARTHY release a proposal to balance the budget over the next 10 years, one of the conditions for having supported his leadership. At the same time, Speaker MCCARTHY has also claimed Republicans won't touch Social Security and Medicare. Now, I will believe that when I see it because so many Republicans, not just a handful—so many—have spent years going on record calling for cuts and changes and privatization of these programs.

All this leads to a terrible conclusion. If Speaker MCCARTHY is going to meet these goals, Republicans would need to cut 85 percent of all discretionary spending in order to balance the budget in 10 years. Let me say that again. If Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans are serious about balancing the budget in their 10-year plan without touching Medicare and Social Security, they will need to cut 85 percent of all discretionary spending. That would be Republican austerity at an apocalyptic level.

Teachers, nurses, firefighters, student loan borrowers, police officers would all kiss Federal funding goodbye. Funding for scientific research, so vital in our competition with China, would likely disappear. Child hunger would spike without Federal nutrition programs. Housing programs would be starved of resources. We would be thrust into a greater housing crisis than we now have.

So my point is this: Speaker MCCARTHY is not going to be able to keep his promise to balance the budget in 10 years while, at the same time, leaving Social Security and Medicare untouched. The math doesn't add up. Very soon, the MAGA brigade will see that the Speaker made a bunch of promises that he won't be able to keep, and I worry greatly that the dangers of slipping into default will only increase as the toxic dynamic within the House GOP gets worse day by day.

That is why it is so important that now, early on, the House Republicans show us their plan.

## THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, on ESG and China—two more items, Mr. President. First, reports are out that Republicans will reintroduce a measure targeting a new rule from the Department of Labor that allows—repeat, allows but not requires—fiduciaries to consider the impacts of climate change and other ESG issues when making investment decisions.

Across the country, hard-right State legislatures are up in arms and trying to stop State investment funds from working with money managers who dare commit the, oh-so heinous offense

of looking at the big picture, looking at the future when making investments, including how climate change and other issues can present financial risks.

I just want to point out the obvious. Nothing in this DOL rule imposes any requirement on anyone. It is not a requirement. In fact, it goes out of the way to make sure decision making remains solely in the hand of the fiduciary.

Republicans like to talk about small government. They like to talk about letting the private sector do its work. But their obsession with eliminating ESG, their sort of ostrichlike view about climate change and the damage that carbon presents when going into the atmosphere, would do just the opposite.

#### CHINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, on the China surveillance balloon and what happened over the weekend, after yesterday's briefing, it is clear our defense and intelligence Agencies remain laser-focused on gathering every piece of information about what happened over U.S. and Canadian airspace.

John Kirby said these most recent objects did not pose any direct threat to people on the ground. That is very important. People should not worry about that. Of course, we have much more to learn. Today, we are going to have another all-Senators briefing on the State of U.S. defense readiness with respect to China. I am sure that will include a discussion of the military but also of our surveillance abilities.

Republicans eager to score political points right at this moment are doing nothing more than engaging in premature attacks. It is precipitous. It is no time for premature partisanship. We need to work together in Congress to get to the bottom of what happened, which Senator TESTER is taking the lead on here in the Senate. I thank him and all of my colleagues of good faith for working together.

#### MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 424

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 424) to protect the seniors of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. In order to place the bill on the calendar, under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

#### TRIBUTE TO DIANNE FEINSTEIN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the longest serving female Senator in American history announced she plans to retire at the end of her record fifth full term.

My good friend DIANNE FEINSTEIN made major history in 1992 when she became the first woman to represent California in the Senate. But, of course, both her knack for notching historic firsts and her commitment to her fellow Golden Staters were very well established by the time she arrived here in Washington.

DIANNE's career in politics began where many do: at the local level. But for DIANNE, that happened to mean shattering glass ceilings in a major metropolis. She was the first woman to serve as president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. While in office, she endured a failed attempt to bomb her home. Then her predecessor as mayor was assassinated. That is when DIANNE became the city's first female mayor. And then she handily beat an attempted recall.

By the time this trailblazer became Senator FEINSTEIN, there was practically nothing that could faze her. DIANNE has been the top Democrat on the Rules Committee, the Intelligence Committee, and the Judiciary Committee.

For decades, she has been one of our country's most formidable legislators across numerous subjects. And, somehow, amid it all, this battle-tested veteran stateswoman has maintained a genuine warmth and collegiality that cuts through even the tensest debates.

Elaine and I have been fortunate to count DIANNE a friend for many years. Elaine and Dick served on a board together in the private sector years ago. Frequently, when Dick was in town, the four of us would go out to dinner. We had a genuine friendship.

So as you can imagine, we hated to lose Dick recently. But the good news is DIANNE will be here for 2 more years as our colleague. And that is very, very good news for Elaine and for me.

#### INFLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now on an entirely different matter, last week, President Biden spent part of his State of the Union Address celebrating what he seemed to think was a victory over inflation. Yesterday, however, another wave of official figures confirmed what working families already knew: The President was simply wrong. The Democrats' football spiking was premature. The American people are hurting badly. The CPI rose another half a point last month, even faster than pre-

dicted, for an overall price hike of 6.4 percent year on year.

Now, mind you, that is not 6.4 percent inflation since President Biden was sworn in. That is an additional 6.4 percent just since February of last year—since February of last year—a baseline that already had an entire previous year of historic and unacceptable inflation already baked into it.

The overall Biden inflation rate is 14.4 percent. The overall Biden inflation rate is 14.4 percent from January 2021 to today. Rents are up 12.7 percent since President Biden took office. Grocery prices are up 19.6 percent. Energy prices are up 38 percent after 2 years of total Democratic control here in Washington.

Prices are still rising out of control. And, even worse, the rate of increase is speeding back up again. This past month was the hottest for inflation since last October.

We have now had 21 straight months above 5 percent annual inflation—a mind-boggling policy failure.

And what does the White House have to say about it? Well, yesterday, the President's press secretary claimed:

The President's economic plan is indeed working.

So I guess the official White House position is that Democrats caused all of this crushing inflation on purpose. This is the kind of insanity that has left just 16 percent of Americans saying they are in a better financial position than they were 2 years ago. That has nearly two-thirds of Americans saying they are living literally paycheck to paycheck. So much preventable pain, because Democrats gambled away families' security on their radical plans and their reckless spending.

#### JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now, on one final matter, yesterday, President Biden and the Senate Democratic leader took time to boast about their judicial confirmations. There was something interesting, strange, and telling about their statements. Both the President and the Democratic leader focused their comments overwhelmingly on identity politics and demographic box-checking.

The President's statement spent literally one part of one sentence paying lip service to the question of legal qualifications. The remaining five paragraphs were devoted solely to these new judges' demographic characteristics. It was really quite bizarre.

President Biden informed the American people that a particular District Court in Puerto Rico will now have its first judge who is not heterosexual. He pointed out that men have been a small minority of his judicial nominees; that certain percentages of his nominees fit into certain demographic categories. He went on and on and on like this.

Most Americans want our country to keep moving forward in a direction where people's physical characteristics

do not define us. Do you know what share of Americans believe race or ethnicity should be a major factor in university admissions? Seven percent. Do you know what percentage believe that gender should be a major factor in university admissions? Four percent.

But when these Democrats talk about our sacred legal system, they sound like the HR department at some liberal university.

The White House statements singled out three judges by name. In all three cases, the President labored some aspect of the judge's identity. In zero—zero—of the three cases did the President have anything to say about their knowledge, intellect, or professional distinction.

It is offensive to all Americans who have a President seeming to view our judiciary as some kind of crude sociological math problem. This is just the kind of thing our Constitution cuts against.

Ironically, when it came to how these new judges actually think, both the President and the Democratic leader went out of their way to celebrate the lack of diversity in their thinking. They bragged about their coordinated and deliberate effort to stuff the judiciary with an unprecedented volume of former criminal defense attorneys.

Democrats have long said they want judges to have empathy. Well, that is good news if you happen to be the party for whom the judge has a special bias; not so good, however, if you are the other party and you are looking for a fair trial.

Now, Democrats are helpfully telling us whom they want judges to empathize with: accused criminals, not innocent victims.

Now, nobody is saying we shouldn't have any public defenders on the bench. But even the New York Times admits the Democrats' sweeping effort to tilt the playing field in one direction is "a sea change in the world of judicial nominations."

When Republicans held the Presidency and the Senate, we spent 4 years confirming staggeringly qualified and incredibly brilliant men and women to the courts, from widely diverse professional and educational credentials.

Back then, even the very liberal outlet Vox.com reported:

Based solely on objective legal credentials—

Objective legal credentials—the average . . . appointee has a far more impressive resume than any past president's nominees.

That was then. So where are we? These days, things are different. To name just one example, significantly smaller shares of this President's nominees have attained prestigious clerkships at the Supreme Court or the appellate level.

To name another example, one person President Biden has put up for a lifetime appointment could not even tell the Judiciary Committee what is in article II or article V of the Constitution.

Look, our courts uphold the rule of law and protect our citizens' rights. The American people deserve a judiciary that contains the smartest, most formidable, and most qualified legal all-stars in our country. And they deserve a President who takes this seriously.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Adrienne C. Nelson, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

### NOMINATION OF ANA C. REYES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote on the nomination of Ana Reyes, who has been nominated to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Ms. Reyes first immigrated to this country when she was 5 years old. At the time, she could not speak any English. That quickly changed through her hard work and with the help of her first-grade teacher, Pat Harkleroad, who came to Ms. Reyes' Louisville, KY, elementary school an hour early each morning to provide one-on-one English lessons.

Born in Montevideo, Uruguay, Ms. Reyes built off of this foundational experience to earn her B.A. summa cum laude from Transylvania University in 1996 and her J.D. magna cum laude from Harvard Law School in 2000.

After clerking for the Honorable Amalya Kearse on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Ms. Reyes joined Williams & Connolly as an associate in 2001. Promoted to partner in 2009, Ms. Reyes has spent her career specializing in complex litigation and international arbitration, trying 10 cases to verdict, judgment, or final decision.

Although she has been in private practice for her whole career, Ms. Reyes has illustrated her commitment

to public service by devoting over 3,300 hours to pro bono work. While her pro bono work spans several fields, including criminal defense, a significant amount of her efforts has been directed towards representing asylum seekers fleeing political persecution, torture, and gender-based violence.

The American Bar Association has unanimously rated Ms. Reyes as "well qualified" to serve on the D.C. District Court and, if confirmed, she will be the first Hispanic woman and the first openly LGBTQ+ person to ever serve on the D.C. District Court.

I look forward to supporting this highly-qualified nominee and urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

### VOTE ON NELSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nelson nomination?

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

### [Rollcall Vote No. 17 Ex.]

#### YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schatz
Booker	Kelly	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Lujan	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

#### NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeben	Rubio
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Budd	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Vance
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Mullin	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Ricketts	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Casey Feinstein

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will

be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 10, Ana C. Reyes, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Jack Reed, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Mark Kelly, Patty Murray, Tim Kaine, Jeff Merkley, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Tammy Baldwin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, John W. Hickenlooper, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Alex Padilla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ana C. Reyes, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 18 Ex.]

#### YEAS—52

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Kelly	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Lujan	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Welch
Fetterman	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Graham	Peters	
Hassan	Reed	

#### NAYS—47

Barrasso	Grassley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Moran	Vance
Daines	Mullin	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—1

Casey

(Mr. MERKLEY assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. WELCH assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The yeas are 52, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ana C. Reyes, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, before I begin some remarks, I would like to advise the desk that I will deliver a portion of my remarks in Spanish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MAIDEN SPEECH

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise today profoundly humbled by the people of California for placing their trust in me to serve and represent them for a full term in the U.S. Senate.

It is a tremendous honor to return to this body, and I also recognize that it is also a tremendous responsibility.

To the people of California, thank you, and please know that I will work hard every single day to uphold that trust.

And to my colleagues who have helped me hit the ground running since my first day in the Senate 2 years ago, thank you, and that includes California's senior Senator, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, who has served the State of California for over three decades as a trailblazing public servant and a model for principled leadership, whom I have been honored to serve alongside.

And I will always be thankful for my parents, Santos and Lupe Padilla, for all they did for my brother, my sister, and me growing up.

And, of course, I could not be here without the love and support and often the patience and understanding of my wife Angela and our three boys, Roman, Alex, and Diego.

Now, as the first Latino elected to represent California in our State's history, it is not lost on me what this moment means for millions of people back home. I understand that my family's story is a reflection of what so many other hardworking families have experienced.

As I have shared many times before, my parents emigrated from Mexico. They came to the United States in search of a better life. For 40 years, my dad worked as a short order cook and my mom cleaned houses as they raised the three of us in the proud, working-class community of Pacoima, CA, in the San Fernando Valley.

I am proud of our family's journey, but it wasn't without our share of challenges. I remember what it looked like to see our neighborhood neglected, navigating everything from buckled sidewalks to drug dealers as we walked to and from school.

I remember what it was like for our family to live paycheck to paycheck—my mom, at times, bartering the mechanic, offering some of her homemade tacos for just a little bit more time to pay the bill.

And when it came time to figuring out how I was going to pay for college, I remember filling out the financial aid forms and realizing that tuition alone at MIT was a larger amount than my dad's W-2.

But it is because of their hard work and sacrifices that I stand here today. The very idea that a first-generation son of a short order cook and a housekeeper is now serving in the U.S. Senate is proof of the American dream.

But that dream has never been about passive participation. It is made possible by those who work for it and by those willing to defend it and expand it. It is about hopeful goals for a better future and the ambition to work towards them. It is about the drive to get up each morning before the sun rises, to put on a white apron, and push through tired eyes and a sore back because you know that someday your kids can have it better.

And if my parents are my inspiration for being here, then my children are my motivation for fighting to keep the dream alive. I am one of the few Members of this body blessed to still have young kids at home. So when we talk about the future of our country or the future of our planet, it is not in the abstract. I think of Roman, Alex, and Diego and their generation. They are the generation who will carry on these monumental tasks and fight for equality and opportunity in the future.

So, colleagues, we have to be focused on doing the work today to make sure the American Dream is alive for them tomorrow.

So I ask: Who is willing to defend the dream? And what are we willing to do to defend it?

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

Who is willing to defend the American dream?

Today, I am here before you as the first Latino elected to represent California in the Senate. It is a dream come true because my family's story reflects what many working families have lived in this country.

My parents, Santos and Lupe Padilla, emigrated from Mexico to this country in the sixties.

For 40 years, my father worked as a cook, and my mother worked cleaning houses.

I am here today thanks to their sacrifices, and they continue to be my inspiration.

Now it is our turn to defend the dream for the next generation.

When we talk about the future of our country, or the future of our planet, I think about my sons Roman, Alex, and Diego.

They are my motivation to continue working for a better future, and to continue defending the American dream.

(End of Spanish translation).

You know, my first 2 years in the Senate, we have made real progress to keep the dream alive for millions of Americans—from giving families the extra support they needed to get through a once-in-a-century pandemic to lowering healthcare costs to passing the largest investment in history to confront the climate crisis—but we can't stop now.

American prosperity over the next 6 years—the survival of the American Dream—means keeping up the fight to level the playing field, and that starts with addressing some of the most urgent threats standing in the way of that dream.

You know, just last month, over the course of 3 days—3 days—my home State experienced three back-to-back-to-back mass shootings that claimed the lives of 19 Californians.

I was returning home from visiting a victim resource center in Monterey Park, CA, when I received word of the two additional shootings in Half Moon Bay and in Oakland.

Americans are sick and tired of the Republican excuses and the gun lobby rhetoric. No one can deny that we have a gun violence problem in America. When gun violence is the leading cause of death for children, how can we say they have the opportunity to achieve their dreams?

So I refuse to grow numb to the epidemic of gun violence. And I still have hope that we can prevent future tragedies with commonsense policies like universal background checks and an assault weapons ban that has been proven to save lives.

This winter California also experienced a relentless stream of severe weather—rain storms, flooding, and mudslides—that caused over \$1 billion in damages. I welcomed President Biden and Vice President HARRIS to survey the storm damage in California, and they have been exemplary partners both in disaster response as well as efforts to rebuild our communities. But the process to rebuild is ongoing, and we will need to work together to get the impacted areas the resources they need.

Let me be clear that, despite the record rainfall that dominated the news last month, California and our fellow Western States are still suffering from a crippling drought. Californians know all too well that natural disasters and extreme weather whiplash have become the new normal in the 21st century. Each year we brace for increasingly frequent and devastating wildfires, catastrophic flooding and mudslides, and searing droughts. They all point to one thing: the need for climate action.

Our very survival depends on our ability to combat the climate crisis. We must continue to step up our efforts to protect our planet. Yes, that means eliminating carbon pollution and transitioning to a clean-energy economy, and it also means fighting for clean air and water, particularly for the more vulnerable communities disproportionately impacted by environmental pollution. And it means protecting and managing our Federal lands and waterways.

At times, that means making difficult and innovative decisions to preserve our resources and protect our communities. For Western States that rely on the Colorado River, that means coming together to find consensus on a water agreement that prevents disaster and preserves the human right to water.

We must also reform our outdated immigration system and do so in a way that better reflects our values. That means creating a pathway to citizenship for the hundreds of thousands of Dreamers who live in daily fear of deportation from the only home they have ever known and for all the essential workers who kept us safe and our economy going throughout the pandemic.

It means making sorely needed updates to our legal migration system by addressing the crippling visa backlog that keeps families apart and denies our economy the workforce that it needs. And it means ensuring that individuals and families who are fleeing horrific conditions in their home countries and seeking asylum in the United States are treated humanely and provided due process.

Our Nation is also confronting a serious mental health crisis. Now, this crisis existed well before COVID, but we saw the pandemic exacerbate the crisis. Demand for healthcare is way up, while we have an increasing shortage of healthcare professionals available.

This is also a critical opportunity to fundamentally end the stigma surrounding mental health. You know, if a family member or a friend breaks their arm or leg, we don't judge them for going to the hospital to seek help. Nobody looks down on somebody for going to the dentist for regular checkups. We need to treat mental health the same way.

And, finally, at a time of rising nationalism around the world, we must secure the foundations of democracy. For those who say that legislation to protect the sacred right to vote in America is too partisan, they are only right in the sense that attacks on our right to vote are partisan.

We must denounce Republican candidates across the country who choose to divide the American people with lies and conspiracy theories. As long as Republican-led State legislatures work to pass voter suppression laws across the Nation or election deniers put our election workers in danger, we have more work to do.

And as long as millions of eligible Americans have yet to exercise their right to vote, including the roughly 80 million who did not vote or were unable to vote in an otherwise record-setting 2020 election, we have more work to do. That work includes bolstering our cyber security efforts, not just to secure the infrastructure of elections but to combat disinformation from bad-faith actors.

Now, I am not naive about the challenges ahead. After 2 years of historic achievements, an extreme wing of Republicans now hold progress in the House of Representatives hostage. This group has shown that they would rather undermine our democracy than defend it. They would rather risk a first-ever default by the Federal Government than serve the interests of the American people.

At stake for millions of Americans are programs that they have spent decades paying into, like Medicare and Social Security, American institutions that define how we take care of one another and how we provide dignity for seniors.

And they have set their crosshairs on a woman's right to make her own decisions about her own body.

So we have a tall task ahead of us. But to the people of California, please know that I didn't seek out this office because I thought it would be easy. I did so because the issues are too important, and I am ready—I am ready—for the difficult fight ahead because today we have a responsibility to write the next chapter of American progress into history, to join so many who came before us who made the American dream possible.

When “huddled masses” came to our shores with the belief in a better future, immigrants put in the work to build our country and our economy and to make the dream a reality. When we celebrate America as the land of freedom and equality, we recognize generations of civil rights activists who risked everything for the right to vote and to expand the dream to groups often denied it.

And when a man from Jalisco and a woman from Chihuahua immigrated to Los Angeles in search of a better life, it was them—Santos and Lupe Padilla—who toiled and sacrificed to secure the dream for their children.

They are the American story. They are the American dream.

In closing, I just want to share that, over the last 2 years, countless people have asked me if becoming a U.S. Senator is a dream come true. My honest answer is no. You see, for me, when I was a kid growing up, I never dreamt that anything like this was possible.

But, now that I am here, I promise I will not take a single day for granted, and I will never stop fighting to keep the dream alive for future generations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

## CRIME

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I rise today to discuss yet another one of the consequences of this President's failed policies, and that is out-of-control crime.

Many Democrats have championed a soft-on-crime agenda that has contributed to soaring crime rates.

According to the Major Cities Chiefs Association, since 2019, violent crime is up 26 percent, aggravated assault is up 34 percent, and homicides are up a staggering 43 percent. This is not only unacceptable, it is terrifying. Repeated calls to defund the police, for open borders, and reduced sentencing or bail requirements have led to a crime increase so overwhelming that America's fear regarding crime in their communities is at a 50-year high.

Though President Biden bears ultimate responsibility here, in many ways he is following the direction of his party when it comes to crime. We have seen a lack of leadership from the White House, an overly politicized Department of Justice, and district attorneys who refuse to prosecute crimes.

The Biden administration has insisted on nominating radical, soft-on-crime advocates to Federal judgeships. While this is an utter disregard for law and order, it is deeply concerning, and it is a trend that we have seen over the last 2 years.

Despite previous efforts to defund the police, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are now walking back their claims that less law enforcement makes us safer. As many Democrat-led cities across the country heeded these calls, the United States experienced the biggest rise in murder since the start of national recordkeeping in 1960.

On top of this, we are experiencing record numbers of police officers who are quitting their profession or they are heading for retirement. Seattle has lost more than one-quarter of its police force in the last 2½ years. Just a short drive from here in DC, in Fairfax County, VA, their police chief declared a personnel emergency and staff shortage last June and installed mandatory overtime to keep their communities protected. Small communities across this country have seen their entire police force quit all at once. And perhaps very alarming, the New York City Police Department saw 3,701 police officers retire or resign in 2022. That is the most since 9/11.

My small State of West Virginia, my home State, is not exempt from these challenges as well. In 2021, the Morgantown Police Department began dealing with a 20-percent reduction in staffing. Our police chief said this was due to the danger associated with being an officer and an overall growing stigma of officers being aggressive or biased. The West Virginia University Police Department is experiencing a similar shortage, with a turnover rate that is still much higher than it was previous to the pandemic.

I live in Charleston, WV. The Charleston Police Department has been

offering large financial incentives to attract officers they desperately need. And the pride of West Virginia, our West Virginia State Police, continues to struggle to keep our State troopers.

We rely on our police for a multitude of services and protection, and in this era of out-of-control crime, we cannot afford to see these shortages continue.

On top of all this, the border crisis continues to fuel the fire of crime and spread illicit narcotics in our communities. Last year, we seized almost 15,000 pounds of fentanyl at our border. Well, in this first quarter, we have already seized 12,500 pounds just this fiscal year. That is only in a quarter of a year.

I see the ramifications of Biden's border crisis in my State, which is disproportionately impacted by the fentanyl and addiction crisis. In 2022, we sadly lost 1,135 West Virginians to overdoses. We have the highest rate of overdose deaths per capita of any State in the Union. There were 6,916 emergency room visits related to overdoses, with our EMS teams responding to another 9,205 suspected overdose calls.

Last week, in Wheeling, WV, local prosecutors indicted drug traffickers who served as "one of the largest suppliers of illicit substances to West Virginia," according to our U.S. Attorney's Office in the Northern District. And I congratulate Bill Ihlenfeld, who is the U.S. attorney in that office.

There was an original drug bust last October that recovered approximately 75 pounds of cocaine, 19 pounds of methamphetamine, and 5 pounds of fentanyl, which is very lethal in very small doses. Investigators found that these traffickers had drugs shipped from the U.S.-Mexico border to Ohio via tractor-trailer or they used cash payments to give to people who flew from California to the Pittsburgh International Airport. The connection between the crisis at our border and the drug epidemic we are seeing at home doesn't get any clearer than that.

Here in our Nation's Capital, amid surging violent crime and police shortages, DC's City Council is attempting a dangerous and irresponsible rewrite of their criminal code. Reducing the penalties for violent crimes—carjackings, robberies, and even homicides—as these numbers rise is incredibly tone deaf to local calls for increased safety and policing. This is happening right in the President's backyard.

So I commend my colleague Senator BILL HAGERTY from Tennessee for introducing a resolution of disapproval to block the DC City Council's dangerous and irresponsible Revised Criminal Code Act of 2022 from taking effect. The DC City Council's legislation is the complete opposite of what we need to control this out-of-control crime.

While I have been talking about concerns for the types of crimes we can see, there are also increasing threats from crimes that could be described as

unseen. These threats emphasize the vulnerability of our children as recent years have pushed their lives into an increasingly digital space. Because of the pandemic, children are learning digitally and have more access to devices than ever before, putting them at an increased risk for luring, grooming, and exploitation.

The data here is incredibly disturbing. One in twenty children will experience some form of sexual abuse before the age of 18. That statistic increases for young girls, with one in five experiencing some form of sexual abuse before the age of 18. Ninety percent of child abuse victims know their abusers, and 60 percent of child sexual abuse victims never tell anyone.

Well, I am a mother of three and a grandmother of eight now, and this is incredibly upsetting to me. We must safeguard our children from things that no child should ever have to experience.

So I would tell President Biden: I hope these statistics are a wake-up call.

Now more than ever, American families are asking for law and order in their communities and peace of mind in their neighborhoods. We as Republicans stand ready to continue our push for solutions that make our country safer and a stronger place to live.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to let these comments be made before the vote, and I will keep them brief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, yesterday, I spoke about a new law passed by the DC City Council. This law lowers penalties for crimes like carjacking and robbery. Thankfully, Congress is stepping in to stop this legislation.

DC, Washington here, should be an example of our American ideals. Sadly, it is becoming an example of the crime we are experiencing across the country in our larger cities. In Chicago, the Midwest, there are new records being broken in the wrong way each week, in New York, and even in places like my State capital of Indianapolis. It should be a wake-up call to crack down. Yet city governments keep going the other way.

The first priority of any government should be the safety of its citizens, especially at the local level, where you live each day. We know a big part of this is not about the laws we have. We have a lot of laws on the books. They are not enforced. In my State capital of Indianapolis, I have a prosecutor who will not enforce those laws, and even in the heart of our country, the Midwest, you have the same issue.

I guess the most disturbing part of all of this is the hatred for our police. They place their safety at hazard to protect ours. Too often, they pay the ultimate price in doing so.



(The remarks of Mr. BRAUN pertaining to the introduction of S. 459 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, we lost a Hoosier recently who spent 7 years fighting ALS. I was proud here, along with Senator COONS, to start the ALS Caucus. ALS is one of those diseases, when you are diagnosed with it, for which there is not a very good prognosis—3 to 4 years, maybe, sometimes.

Corey Polen from Indiana was able to stretch it out to 7 years and fought valiantly along the way. He was involved in trying to take his cause and help others. Currently, there is no cure, and there is severely limited access to treatment options.

Since I have been here, I have been trying to reform healthcare in general. That is a task when you have one side of the aisle that doesn't think there is anything to do there or isn't interested in it and the other side maybe wanting to have more government when I think we need to reform it in an underlying way and make it more transparent, more competitive, and remove barriers to entry so that you have doctors and nurses wanting to come into the profession.

Let's take this commonsense part of it. This is a disease, along with several other diseases, for which, once you are diagnosed, you do not have time, and you are beset by a cumbersome process that keeps people from getting into and even staying in treatment. We need to fix that to where, through the Promising Pathway Act, which I have had out there and which is gaining stride, we need to make an exception for those ailments that have treatments in progress and where the individuals suffering from them are willing to take the risk. They want to do that because there is no other option, especially when there are promising treatments that you are working with.

In Corey's case, his journey began in October 2015. He was hiking with his wife Jennifer in Arizona. On that hike, he kind of hurt his ankle and noticed more. He then returned to his hometown and wanted to look into it further. That is when he got that bleak diagnosis.

All along the journey, as his condition was getting worse, he was out there to help others with it. His main goal for us here in Congress was for us to get something like the Promising Pathway Act across the finish line, which would give hope to him and to all of the others with similar diseases who are frustrated by the fact that we can't move quickly enough, especially when there is stuff in the works that looks like it is going to be someday, if not a cure, at least a mitigation to the disease. We weren't able to get that done.

I would ask my fellow Senators and someone else in the House to carry it. We need to get this across the finish line. A panel of FDA advisers voted 7 to

2 that there was enough evidence to do something different. That gave hope to people like Corey and others that something would get done, but it hasn't happened. We have this under our own control to get it done, and it is well past time to get it done.

I have been here going on now into my fifth year, and we have been dragging our feet. I am going to roll up my sleeves and get it done, and we are going to keep pursuing this effort through our ALS Caucus. Senator COONS and I have done it, and we have made headway. But why wouldn't we, when we have been dawdling with this issue for so long, not give the benefit of the doubt to treatments that are promising and get this across the finish line for these individuals who have no other hope but for us to get it done?

I yield the floor.

### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 11, Daniel J. Calabretta, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Jack Reed, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Mark Kelly, Patty Murray, Tim Kaine, Jeff Merkley, Sheldon Whitehouse, Elizabeth Warren, Tammy Baldwin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, John W. Hickenlooper, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Alex Padilla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Daniel J. Calabretta, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 19 Ex.]

#### YEAS—52

Baldwin	Durbin	King
Bennet	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Fetterman	Luján
Booker	Gillibrand	Manchin
Brown	Graham	Markey
Cantwell	Hassan	Menendez
Carper	Heinrich	Merkley
Collins	Hickenlooper	Murkowski
Coons	Hirono	Murphy
Cortez Masto	Kaine	Murray
Duckworth	Kelly	Ossoff

Padilla	Shaheen	Warnock
Peters	Sinema	Warren
Reed	Smith	Welch
Rosen	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Sanders	Tester	Wyden
Schatz	Van Hollen	
Schumer	Warner	

#### NAYS—46

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Budd	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Vance
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Mullin	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Ricketts	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Cardin	Casey
--------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The yeas are 52, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel J. Calabretta, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the vote on confirmation of the Calabretta nomination occur at 11 a.m. tomorrow, Thursday, February 16; that the cloture vote on the Martinez-Lopez nomination occur following disposition of the Reyes nomination; and if cloture is invoked on the Martinez-Lopez nomination, the confirmation vote occur following disposition of the Calabretta nomination; further, that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Kahn nomination be at 1:45 p.m.; finally, that following my remarks and the remarks of Senator BARRASSO, the Senate stand in recess until 4 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, Senators should expect two rollcall votes at 4:30 p.m. today and three rollcall votes tomorrow.

#### PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Madam President, there is a lot of discussion in our country about how divided we are as a people, and there is no question that on many issues, that is absolutely true.

But it turns out that on one of the most important matters facing the American people, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, progressives, moderates, and conservatives are all united, and they are united on the need to take on the outrageous corporate greed in the pharmaceutical industry



and to substantially lower the incredibly high prices we pay for prescription drugs in this country.

On that issue, the American people are quite united. Today, millions of Americans are forced to make the unacceptable choice between feeding their families or buying the medicine they need to ease their pain or to stay alive. Seniors from Vermont to Alaska are forced to split their pills in half because they don't have enough money to fill their prescriptions. Nobody really knows how many people die each year because they lack the medicine that their doctors prescribe.

But a 2020 study by West Health found that by the year 2030, over 100,000 Medicare recipients could die prematurely every year because they cannot afford to buy their lifesaving medicine—100,000 seniors every year. All over this country, in every State in this country, the American people are asking some pretty simple questions. They want to know how does it happen that in the United States, we pay by far—not even close—the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. How does it happen? Why is it, people are asking, that nearly one out of every four Americans cannot afford the prescriptions that their doctors write?

Think about how crazy that is. People walk into a doctor's office. They get a diagnosis. The doctor writes out a script. They can't afford to fill that prescription. They get sicker or maybe they end up in the emergency room, maybe they end up in the hospital, maybe they die. People are asking: How does it happen that nearly half of all new drugs in the United States cost more than \$150,000 a year? They cost more than \$150,000 a year.

A few years ago, I took a busload of people dealing with diabetes from Detroit, MI, over the Canadian border to a drugstore in Windsor, Ontario. I think the trip took us maybe 45 minutes. There in Windsor, Canada, people on the bus—diabetics—were able to purchase the same insulin products that they bought in the United States for one-tenth the price—a 45-minute trip, same product, one-tenth the price. I will never forget it. Tears were coming down the eyes of people who were buying their product. They couldn't believe how much money they were saving.

In 1999, 24 years ago, I was a Member of Congress, and I took another busload of people. This time it was women in northern Vermont who were suffering with breast cancer. We took them to a pharmacy in Montreal, Canada. Once again, they paid one-tenth the price for tamoxifen, a breast cancer drug that they desperately needed.

So how does it happen that in Canada and other major countries, the same exact medicines manufactured by the same exact companies are sold for a fraction of the price that we pay in America? It is a simple question. It is a question Democrats, Republicans, Independents—everybody wants an answer to it.

Well, the truth is that the answer to that question, in my view, is not complicated. In fact, it can be summed up in just three words, and that is unacceptable corporate greed—unacceptable corporate greed.

Over the past 25 years, the pharmaceutical industry has spent \$8.5 billion on lobbying—\$8.5 billion on lobbying and over \$745 million on campaign contributions so that we can continue to pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs.

Incredibly, last year, drug companies hired over 1,700 lobbyists to knock on every door in the Capitol—1,700 lobbyists—former leaders of the Democratic Party, former leaders of the Republican Party. There are 535 Members of Congress. They have 1,700 lobbyists from the pharmaceutical industry—three lobbyists for every Member of Congress.

Meanwhile, as Americans die because they cannot afford the medications they need, the pharmaceutical industry makes higher profits every year than other major industries. Year after year after year, they lead the index in terms of their profits. Between the years 2000 and 2018, drug companies in this country made over \$8 trillion—that is with a “t”—\$8 trillion in profits. In fact, in 2021, just 10 pharmaceutical companies in the United States made a total of more than \$102 billion in profits, up 137 percent from the previous year.

It is the greed that we are seeing manifest itself—not just in corporate profits. It also manifests itself in the exorbitant compensation packages that the pharmaceutical industry has given to its CEOs and other top executives within the industry.

I hope that people who are listening to us this afternoon—people who can't afford to pay for their prescription drugs—hear this, and that is according to a report done by the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee staff, which I chair, released today: In 2021, while hundreds of thousands of Americans died from COVID, 50 pharmaceutical executives in just 10 companies made \$1.9 billion in total compensation—50 executives, \$1.9 billion. The same 50 executives are in line to receive \$2.8 billion in golden parachutes once they leave their companies.

Let me give you just a few examples. AbbVie CEO Richard Gonzalez made nearly \$62 million in total compensation in 1 year. The CEO of Eli Lilly, David Ricks, made more than \$67 million in 1 year. Incredibly, the CEO of Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Leonard Schleifer, made nearly \$453 million in total compensation in 1 year—\$453 million in 1 year.

Meanwhile, while we are told over and over again that the reason we have such high drug prices in America is because of the need of the drug companies to invest in research and development—that is what we are told over and over again: We need to charge you outrageous prices so that we can use

that money to invest in research and development for new drugs. Well, it turns out that over the past decade, 14 major pharmaceutical companies spent \$747 billion not to research and develop lifesaving drugs but to make their wealthy shareholders even wealthier by buying back their own stock and handing out huge dividends. It turns out, amazingly enough—or maybe not amazingly—that the drug companies spent \$87 billion more on stock buybacks and dividends than they spent on research and development.

So when you hear about all of the need for high prices for research and development, they spent \$87 billion more on stock buybacks and dividends than on research and development.

The truth is, we are dealing here today not just with an economic issue in terms of the high price of prescription drugs—it is a very, very important economic issue—but we are dealing with something even more profound, and that is the moral issue. The question, I think, that Americans should be asking themselves is, Is it morally acceptable that tens of thousands of people die each year in our country because they cannot afford the medicine their doctors prescribe, while at the same time the drug companies make billions in profits and provide their CEOs with huge compensation packages?

Is it morally acceptable that, at a time when the taxpayers of this country spent tens of billions a year on research and development for lifesaving drugs, many of these same taxpayers who helped fund the research and development for new drugs are unable to afford those drugs?

Is it morally acceptable that the business model of the pharmaceutical industry today is primarily not to create the lifesaving drugs we need for cancer, Alzheimer's, heart disease, diabetes, and so many other terrible illnesses, but, rather, through their excessive greed, to make as much money as they possibly can?

I should point out that it has not always been that way. There was once a time when the inventors of lifesaving drugs were not obsessed with making huge sums of money but were, instead, obsessed with ending the terrible illnesses that plagued humanity.

In the 1950s, for example, there was Dr. Jonas Salk, who invented the vaccine for polio. Salk's work saved millions of lives and prevented millions more from suffering paralysis. It has been estimated that if Dr. Salk had chosen to patent the polio vaccine, he would have made billions of dollars. But he did not.

When asked who owns the patent for this vaccine, this is what Dr. Salk said:

Well, the people, I would say. There is no patent. Could you patent the sun?

What Dr. Salk understood was that the purpose of the vaccine he invented was to save lives, to make sure that as many people all over the world were able to receive it, and not to make himself obscenely rich.

And Salk, among other great scientists, was not alone. In 1928, Alexander Fleming, a scientist from Scotland, discovered penicillin at St. Mary's Hospital in London. Fleming's discovery of penicillin changed the medical world and saved millions of lives.

I am sure that Alexander Fleming could also have become a multibillionaire if he had chosen to own the exclusive rights for this antibiotic. But he did not.

When Fleming was asked about his role, he did not talk about the outrageous fortune he could have made through his discovery. Instead, he said:

I did not invent penicillin. Nature did that. I only discovered it by accident.

And then there was the great scientist Frederick Banting from Canada. In 1921, Dr. Banting, along with two other scientists at the University of Toronto, invented insulin—insulin, a drug we are hearing a whole lot about now. When Dr. Banting was asked why he wouldn't patent insulin and why he sold the rights to his invention for \$1—\$1—he replied:

Insulin does not belong to me. It belongs to the world.

Frederick Banting.

It has been estimated that Dr. Banting's invention of insulin saved some 300 million lives. Once again, in Dr. Banting, we saw a great scientist make it clear that his purpose in life was to help humanity prevent suffering and save lives, not just to make billions for himself.

Meanwhile, while Dr. Banting sold his patent for insulin for \$1 so that humanity could benefit from his discovery, I should point out that Eli Lilly, one of our Nation's largest drug companies, has increased the price of insulin by 1,200 percent over the past 27 years, to \$275, while it costs just \$8 to manufacture—selling it for 275 bucks and it costs \$8 to manufacture—not quite the spirit of Frederick Banting.

Now, let's fast forward to the Covid pandemic, this horrible moment in our history when we have lost over 1 million Americans and tens of millions have suffered various levels of illness.

Moderna, a drug company in Massachusetts, worked alongside the National Institutes of Health to develop the vaccine that so many of our people have effectively used—used by millions of people effectively. It is widely acknowledged that both the company and the National Institutes of Health, or NIH, were responsible for the creation of this vaccine. They worked together.

After the company received billions of dollars from the Federal Government to research, develop, and distribute the COVID vaccine, well, guess what happened. It turns out that the CEO of Moderna, Stephane Bancel, became a billionaire overnight and is now worth \$5.7 billion. Further, the two co-founders of Moderna, Noubar Afeyan and Robert Langer, also became billionaires and are now both worth \$2 billion each. And one of the founding in-

vestors in Moderna, Tim Springer, is worth \$2.5 billion.

None of them were billionaires before the taxpayers of our country funded the research and development for the COVID-19 vaccine, and, collectively, this handful of people at Moderna are now worth over \$11 billion. Meanwhile, Moderna, as a whole, made over \$19 billion in profits during the pandemic.

Given that reality, given the enormous amount of taxpayer support, how has the CEO of this company thanked the taxpayers of America for the huge profits that Moderna has experienced and for the incredible wealth that he and his other executives have experienced?

Well, he is thanking them by proposing to quadruple the price of the COVID vaccine to about \$130 once the government stockpile runs out. And let us be clear, by the way, this is a vaccine that costs just \$2.85 to manufacture.

On March 22, the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee will be holding a hearing to discuss this subject, and the bottom line that we will be discussing is this: Does Moderna think that it is appropriate to quadruple prices for the vaccine after receiving billions of dollars in taxpayer support?

While Moderna may be a poster child for contemporary corporate greed, certainly, they are not alone. A number of years ago, the former CEO of Gilead became a billionaire by charging \$1,000 for SOVALDI, a hepatitis C drug that was discovered by scientists at the Veterans' Administration. This drug costs just \$1 to manufacture and can be purchased in India for \$4.

The Japanese drug maker Astellas, which made a billion dollars in profits in 2021, recently raised the price of the prostate cancer drug Xtandi by more than 75 percent in the United States to nearly \$190,000. This is a drug that was invented by federally funded scientists at UCLA and can be purchased in Canada for one-sixth the price charged in America. Taxpayers funded the development of the drug and now pay six times more than Canadians do for the same product. And it goes on and on and on.

There is no rational reason why the HIV treatment, BIKTARVY, costs over \$45,000 per year in the United States but only \$7,500 in France, or why a weekly dose of the autoimmune medicine Enbrel costs over \$1,700 in the United States but just \$300 in Canada—et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. It goes on and on and on.

The American people, regardless of their political affiliations, are sick and tired of being ripped off by the pharmaceutical industry. Now is the time for us to have the courage to take on the 1,700 lobbyists all over Capitol Hill, to take on the unlimited financial resources of that industry. Now is the time to stand with the American people and substantially lower prescription drug prices in our country, and the

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee is going to be actively involved in that process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The senior Senator from Wyoming.

CHINA

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about the threat posed by China.

On February 4, our Air Force shot down a Chinese spy balloon. They did it over the coast of South Carolina. The balloon had spied upon the United States for up to a week. One of the places that it monitored and hovered over was my home State of Wyoming.

Now, Joe Biden did absolutely nothing until the balloon had already crossed thousands of miles of the United States. To me, this is another national failure from a President who already brought us surrender in Afghanistan.

People in Montana could see the balloon from the ground. That is the way America found out about it. It wasn't from the administration. It wasn't from the military. It was from a reporter on the ground with a telephoto lens. The man took a picture from his driveway.

I am not convinced that Joe Biden would have done anything if that photographer in Montana hadn't published those pictures online.

It is hard to imagine any other President letting a spy balloon fly over our country for nearly a week. Imagine John F. Kennedy allowing a Soviet spy plane over the United States. To me, it is unimaginable. No President, Republican or Democrat, would tolerate this, until Joe Biden.

On Thursday, the Senate received a classified briefing on the spy balloon. I am not alone when I say I was disturbed and disquieted about what we learned. To me, Joe Biden did too little, too late, and then he did what he always does. He bragged about it. He said he had done everything right. To quote him, he said:

We did the right thing.

No, Joe Biden did the weak thing, as usual. He had to be shamed into shooting down the balloon—way too late.

On Thursday, Joe Biden defended himself again. He said the balloon was “not a major breach”—“not a major breach.” It reminds me when Joe Biden signaled he would let Vladimir Putin make a minor incursion into Ukraine. President Biden is defending the indefensible.

Just days after the balloon incident, he gave his annual State of the Union address. We were there. There were a number of bizarre moments in the President's speech, and one of the most bizarre to me was when he talked about China.

He said no world leader would want to be Xi Jinping—no world leader would want to be Xi Jinping. He actually yelled it several times.

What was he trying to say? Does he still think that China is not a threat?

Communist China is our No. 1 geopolitical threat. They are our rival. They have the second largest economy in the world. They have over 2 million active military personnel. They have the largest navy in the world, and China plans to build more than 100 new ships, 300 new missile silos, and hundreds of nuclear missiles by the end of this decade.

China is working day and night to get stronger. China is working to challenge the United States as the world's superpower.

And Joe Biden seems to be doing the opposite. He is making our own country weaker and poorer and less prepared.

China isn't the one opening the border to the whole world to come in. China isn't the one spending themselves into bankruptcy. China isn't the one shutting down their energy production. It is Joe Biden who is doing those things—a President who is soft on China.

Now, he has been soft on China his entire career. When he was in the Senate, he helped China join the World Trade Organization. He helped China pay low tariffs under Bill Clinton. This helped China flood our country with cheap, poorly made consumer goods.

By the time Joe Biden was Vice President, the threat from China was obvious, but he was still soft on China.

When he was Vice President, Joe Biden said "The growth of China is overwhelmingly in our interest." That was Joe Biden as Vice President.

He should tell that to the factory workers who lost their jobs all across America. He should tell that to the families who have buried their children because of Chinese fentanyl.

When he was running for President, Joe Biden repeatedly downplayed any threat from China. He said of China, in his announcement to run for President, he said China is "not bad, folks."

Now, he should tell that to the 1 million Uighurs who are living as slaves and forced to work in the west of China.

As a candidate, Joe Biden said China is "not competition for us."

Well, I have got news for Joe Biden. China's economy has grown 12-fold in the last 20 years. China now has more missile launchers than we do. It is painfully obvious that China is trying to compete with us. Joe Biden is the only one who doesn't get it.

On Friday, former Senator Max Baucus, who I served with, from Montana, revealed that China wanted Joe Biden to be President.

Now, Senator Baucus was a Member of this body, and then he was tapped to be President Obama's Ambassador to China. So Senator Baucus knows a lot about China, knows a number of Chinese officials. And on Friday, he admitted Chinese officials told him that China wanted Joe Biden to be elected President.

Of course they did. In recent weeks, we found out that Joe Biden kept classified information at his home and in his private office.

So where was this private office? Well, the office was at something called the Penn Biden Center at the University of Pennsylvania. The university paid Joe Biden nearly \$1 million to do virtually nothing. Joe Biden says he was a professor yet never taught a single class. And he left classified documents at the Penn Biden Center.

Now, reportedly, these documents were related to Iran and Ukraine. I haven't seen the documents, but those are the reports.

And what is the relationship with China and this center? Well, Chinese donors gave \$61 million to the university between 2017 and 2020.

Both the House and the Senate need to investigate whether these donations were legal, and we need to know if Chinese money is influencing the Biden administration's policies.

On Thursday, I came to the floor and spoke about how Joe Biden's energy policies are helping China. Later that day, we found out yet another connection between Joe Biden's energy policies and China. We found out that the White House and the Secretary of Energy met with an environmental group with ties to China.

The group is, interestingly, called the Rocky Mountain Institute, and the group was paid by the Chinese Government to study green energy.

Now Secretary of Energy Jennifer Granholm wants their advice too.

Enough is enough. It is time to act with strength against China. The sanctions that the administration announced are just a slap on the wrist.

The House passed a resolution condemning China for violating our airspace. The vote was unanimous. Every Republican voted for it and every Democrat voted for it. Why aren't we taking it up here in the Senate?

There is a whole host of legislation we need to pass here in the Senate to stand up to China.

I have introduced legislation to ban administration officials from going to work for China.

The top lawyer today—the top lawyer today in our intelligence community used to work for China. Before that, he worked in the Obama White House. Revolving door—Democrat administration, China, Democrat administration.

He worked for the Obama White House. He worked for Huawei—of course, we know Huawei is a telecommunications company controlled by the Chinese Government. Now he is one of the top lawyers on the payroll of Joe Biden.

There is much more that needs to be done in relation to China. China is going to try to spy on us again. China is going to keep challenging us. It is time for us to stand up to the challenge.

Now, what happened with this spy balloon can never be allowed to happen again. America cannot afford Joe Biden's policies of weakness.

I yield the floor.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 4 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:21, recessed until 4 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MURPHY).

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

### MEDICARE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a leading philosopher of the last century—his name was Jean-Paul Sartre—famously once said that "existence precedes essence." In other words, Sartre's words, not mine: To be is to act.

In other words, my words, not Mr. Sartre's. In other words: What you do is what you believe. What you do is what you believe, not what you say. What you do is what you believe, and everything else is just cottage cheese.

I think that is particularly relevant to our government in Washington, DC, and indeed to probably all forms of government in America. We are what we do, not what we say.

As the Presiding Officer knows, we are in negotiations with respect to the debt limit. I, for one—and I think almost all, if not all, of my colleagues in the Senate will agree with me on this. We will not default on America's debt. We will not. But in conjunction with addressing that issue of the debt limit, many of our colleagues in the House and many of our colleagues here in the Senate would like to talk to President Biden about what we can do as a Congress and as a President to keep us from getting in this situation again, where we have to so radically raise the debt limit.

In other words, the request to the President is: Mr. President, let's sit down and talk about how we can slow the rate of growth in our spending and slow the rate of growth in our debt accumulation, for a variety of reasons, not only pertaining to the debt limit but also pertaining to trying to get control of the budget. And I hope the President will accept that invitation.

In those negotiations, the President has said—incorrectly, in my judgment—but he has said repeatedly, as have some of my Democratic friends, that, well, all the Republicans want to do—all the Republicans want to do in these negotiations is hurt Medicare and hurt Social Security.

Now, I understand politics. We both do. We have been doing this for a long time, and politically I understand why the President and some of my colleagues are saying that. It is not true,

of course. And I don't think it is beneficial to these negotiations. But the fact that the President is saying this and saying, well, you Republicans want to hurt Medicare, for example, I find to be quite ironic—extraordinarily ironic—maybe even a tad hypocritical.

In Washington, DC, you have to watch what people do, not what they say.

In the waning days of the last Congress—once again, watching what people do, not what they say—President Biden, who has accused Members of my party of wanting to hurt Medicare, tried to cut Medicare himself.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—CMS, as we call it, as you know—every year proposes what is called a physician's fee schedule for doctors who treat Medicare patients. If you are a doctor and you have a Medicare patient, you don't get to send the Federal Government a bill for whatever you think your services are worth. That is not the way it works.

Medicare, every year, through the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—CMS—every year proposes a physician fee schedule. They tell the physicians that this is what you can charge and not a penny more.

President Biden's CMS, last year, proposed to cut all physician payments, all provider payments by 4.5 percent. He didn't want to lift up Medicare; he wanted to cut it—not Republicans, the President.

Now, why is that important?

Well, a lot of physicians won't take Medicare anymore because they say—and they won't take Medicaid either, for that matter. They say: We just can't. We can't turn a profit. We are not looking to make, say the physicians, obscene profits, but we are in the middle of inflation. Healthcare inflation is as real as anything else. We are paying more in rent. We are paying more for our nurses. We are paying more for supplies. And the Medicare fees that we are paying to treat folks on Medicaid and Medicare, they are not keeping up. They are just not.

And so here comes President Biden, through his Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, CMS—here comes President Biden, the champion of Medicare, he proposed a 4.5-percent across-the-board cut for every physician treating Medicare in America. That is 900,000 people in my State.

So I am sitting there listening to this, hearing the President say: All the Republicans want to do is hurt Medicare, on the left hand, but on the right hand he is trying to cut all the physicians and other providers in the program—we have 900,000 people in my State in the program—by 4.5 percent in the middle of rising inflation. I just found that extraordinary. Watch what people do, not what they say.

So I introduced a bill. The name of my bill was Protecting Medicare Patients and Physicians Act. It would have eliminated—it would have eliminated that 4- to 4.5-percent cut that

President Biden wanted to impose on Medicare doctors. I came to the body of this Senate to present that bill. And I didn't come to my colleagues with a problem; I came with a solution. I wasn't going to say: Well, let's just don't cut Medicare doctors and eliminate the cut. I said let's do eliminate the cut, but I have a way to pay for it. I am not suggesting that we reject President Biden's attempt to cut Medicare and fill the hole by borrowing the money. I said, I have got a solution.

I found \$9.8 billion sitting in a fund at the Department of Health and Human Services. It was \$9.8 billion when I was able to get the data. I suspect at one point it got as high as \$15 billion. It was called the Provider Relief Fund. As the President knows, this Congress appropriated lots of money to our healthcare providers to help them deal with COVID, and not all of the money, thankfully, was needed. Many of the healthcare providers returned some of the money. And at the time I presented the bill, there was \$9.8 billion that had been returned and was sitting in an account at the Department of Health and Human Services—way more than enough—way more than enough to prevent a 4-percent and, in some cases, a 4-percent-plus cut to Medicare that President Biden proposed.

I went to every one of my Republican colleagues in the Senate. They all said: We are with you, Kennedy. Let's do it.

So I came to this floor. I came to this floor to ask for unanimous consent, and that, as you know, is where you present a bill, and if nobody objects, it is passed.

But there was an objection, and it came from a good friend and a good man, Senator RON WYDEN, who is chairman of our Finance Committee.

There aren't words in English to express how much I respect RON WYDEN. But Senator WYDEN came to the floor and said: Kennedy, I am going to object to your bill. He said: I don't want you to worry about this. We are aware that President Biden has proposed to cut every Medicare physician in America, but we are not going to let him do that. We are putting together a budget bill right now. We call it the omnibus. We are putting together a budget bill right now that is going to address that problem, and that is why I am objecting to your bill. Your bill, Kennedy, is unnecessary.

Now, I am not blaming this on Chairman WYDEN. I am not. The omnibus passed with a vote of, I think, virtually all, if not all, of my Democratic colleagues and with some Republican colleagues. So I am not saying it is Senator WYDEN's fault. But, after the omnibus passed—I didn't vote for it, in part, because I didn't know what was in it. But, after the omnibus passed, I went back and looked, and lo and behold, the omnibus bill, which passed at the encouragement of President Biden and with a lot more votes from my Democratic friends than my Republican colleagues, had a 2-percent cut

for every provider, every physician, who treats a Medicare patient in America—a 2-percent cut. That is better than a 4-percent cut, but it is still a cut at a time of raging inflation.

Now, I don't know yet what that impact is going to be on healthcare and the healthcare delivery system in my State. I don't know how many more physicians—after President Biden has cut their fees, I don't know how many more physicians are going to stand up and say: I can't take Medicare patients anymore.

I hope none, but I suspect some.

Oh, and let me mention this. I talked about that pool of money, the provider relief fund, that had \$9.8 billion in it—maybe \$15 billion—sitting there in an account, unspent, unappropriated. What happened to it? I don't know. It got spent on something, but it didn't get spent on helping Medicare doctors and patients. They got cut 2 percent.

So I am going to end like I began. In this town, you have to watch what people do, not what they say. The President can try to blame the Republicans and say: Well, they don't want to seriously negotiate about controlling spending and controlling debt. All they want to do is cut Medicare.

He already did it. He did it in December.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business and that Senator BENNET be allowed to conclude his remarks before the vote today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ABORTION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to continue to raise the alarm about how Republicans' extreme, ongoing attacks on reproductive rights are putting women's lives at risk, are trampling the will of the American people, who supported the right to abortion, by the way, everywhere it was on the ballot last November, and are even undermining care for patients in States like mine, which have strong abortion protections.

In fact, right now, a truly extreme lawsuit, which some far-right Republicans in Congress just filed a brief supporting, is seeking to overturn the FDA's longstanding approval of a safe and effective medication used in abortion care. This suit could cause chaos nationwide and rip abortion medication away from patients in every single State, potentially even from my constituents in Washington State.

I have been clear that the overturning of *Roe v. Wade* last year was not the end of the fight to protect reproductive rights. Unfortunately, it was just the starting gun for even more extreme attacks from far-right Republicans. We have already seen 14 extreme State abortion bans go into effect—from bans that set bounties for information about anyone who gets an

abortion or helps to provide one to bans that even lack exceptions for rape and incest and the life and well-being of moms. Some States are even passing new bans to try and get around State courts that block their first ones or laws to get around the fact that their own constituents backed the right to abortion in a statewide vote last year.

Here in Congress, we saw Senate Republicans introduce a national abortion ban last year, and it was one of the first things the Republican House voted on this year. We are still seeing new, appalling proposals from extreme Republicans across the country.

While Republicans here in Congress blocked our bill to make sure doctors cannot be jailed for providing an abortion, Republican State legislators have drafted bills to make sure women can be prosecuted for getting an abortion.

While Republicans in Congress blocked our bill to protect the right to travel across State lines for an abortion, State lawmakers have bills to stop employers from helping employees travel for an abortion.

Right next door to my home State, there is a bill in Idaho that could lead to parents and grandparents being charged with human trafficking for helping minors travel out of State so they can get an abortion. That is appalling.

Republican politicians have investigated a doctor for providing care to a child who was raped. They have proposed funding to jail people for abortions. They have talked about using existing child endangerment laws to prosecute women who use abortion pills. They have made it harder for patients to get birth control and even the treatments they need for life-threatening illnesses, like cancer.

There are Republican attorneys general suing, right now, because the Biden administration told pharmacists they can't discriminate against pregnant patients and because the administration reminded care providers that, when a woman's life is at stake, they are required by Federal law to provide the necessary care, and that includes abortion.

Then there is the case I mentioned earlier, whereby a far-right group is trying, right now, to ban mifepristone, an important abortion medication, nationwide, and I mean all across the country, including in my home State of Washington and in every other State that has strong protections for abortion. There are 22 Republican attorneys general and 67 Republicans right here in Congress who have filed briefs in support of that outlandish lawsuit.

Now, let's be clear about what is going on here. In this lawsuit, these far-right extremists are asking one district judge to overrule the FDA's experts and rulemaking authority in order to undermine healthcare for patients nationwide by declaring a drug that was approved over 20 years ago as unsafe.

Let's set the record straight right now because there has been so much

misinformation on this, including from Republican Members of Congress.

Mifepristone is safe, and it is effective for ending a pregnancy during the first 10 weeks. The FDA determined that decades ago. The science is done. The results are in. They have been for over 20 years. Mifepristone is safe. This lawsuit is not about science; it is about ideology. It is not about protecting women; it is about controlling their bodies.

The reality of what extreme Republicans have already caused with their abhorrent bans is a nightmare. Because of Republican bans, women facing miscarriages have already been unable to get the care they need for days on end. They have already been left bleeding, getting sicker and sicker, and pleading for help. Doctors are already being forced to compromise medical care, leave patients in pain, and even forgo providing lifesaving care because they fear far-right politicians will jail them for doing their job. Abortion providers in States like mine are already overworked, overbooked, and overwhelmed with patients who have had to wait weeks and travel hundreds of miles to get an abortion because of Republican bans. This lawsuit will make things much worse.

Mifepristone is used in over half of the abortions. Taking that drug away would mean fewer options for women, longer waits for people who are seeking care, stress for patients and providers, and chaos for a healthcare system that Republicans have already put in crisis.

It is cruel and utterly unnecessary. There is no reason for this.

You don't have to take my word for this, by the way. Listen to doctors and patients, and listen to women, because that is exactly what I have been doing.

I am not going to stop. I am going to continue to make sure their stories are being heard, especially when they are hard stories to hear, because we will not be quiet. I am going to continue to be their voice and vote here in the Senate, and I am going to keep putting a spotlight on their concerns and on the threats to their health, like these extreme abortion bans and ideology abortion lawsuits. I am going to be here, raising the alarm, fighting to pass commonsense legislation to protect our rights, being a firewall against extreme Republican attacks against abortion, and working, meanwhile, to build the support we need to restore Roe once and for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, before I speak on what brings me to the floor, let me thank Chair MURRAY for her incredible advocacy on behalf of not just the women of her State and not just the women of my State but of women and their families all across the United States of America. I want to say how grateful I am.

Thank you.

#### SPACE COMMAND

Mr. President, we have had, over the last 10 days or so, or 2 weeks or so, in the Senate, briefing after briefing that our constituents never get the chance to see. These are briefings by the intelligence community, by the Department of Defense, about what the nature of the global threat is to the United States and the state of our national security—what they call the net effect between where we are as a strategic force and where our competitors are as strategic forces.

Without revealing anything that I have heard in any of those classified sessions, either in those sessions or as a member of the Intelligence Committee, I can tell you that I have found these briefings to be very sobering over the years. I would be surprised if there isn't a single Member of the Senate who doesn't feel the same way as I do. We have our work cut out for us. It is time for us to move from a 20th century mindset when it comes to our national defense and to our national security to a 21st century mindset. That is not going to be easy. We are going to have a lot of choices to make as a body to do that, but I am confident we will do it.

One of the places we have a lot of ground to cover is in space. My colleague from Colorado is on the floor this evening. I am very glad that he is here because he was the Governor of Colorado, and he knows this issue as well as anybody in this Chamber, and I have seen it from the Intelligence Committee.

You know, I deeply regret the fact that, for many years, among other things, we have enabled the Chinese—in particular, Beijing, and I should say it specifically—to steal a lot of our technology to be able to benefit their national security in the space race that we have. So I am really focused on this because we have had, based in Colorado for many years, something called a Space Command, which is the unified combatant control for space in the United States of America. The home has been in Colorado, and it has always been in Colorado.

I am not going to bore you with one of the saddest stories that I know about a process run completely awry that resulted in the top generals in the Air Force walking into the White House with a recommendation that said we ought to leave the Space Command in Colorado. By the way, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force in the Trump administration was part of making that recommendation to the last White House. They walked into that White House with, as I said, the recommendation that it stay at the Peterson Air Force Base—now the Peterson Space Force Base—in Colorado.

There were three principal reasons they were arguing that it should stay there. One was that it would reach full operational capability in Colorado faster than if it were moved anywhere else,

between 4 and 6 years faster; that it would be cheaper to repurpose assets in Colorado for the Space Command than to move it across the country or to move it somewhere else; and that there would be massive attrition if the Space Command were moved. Of course, roughly 60 percent of the personnel who are part of the Space Command are civilians. They are not people who are in the Department of Defense, although 40 percent are people who are in the Department of Defense. That worries me a lot. All those things worry me a lot.

But nothing was of more concern to me—especially in the wake now of Putin's invasion of Ukraine, nothing is more important than making sure that we get to full operational capability and that we do it in a way that makes sense. That is where the generals were on this issue. That is where the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force was.

In fact, the people who went in to see President Trump said: If you are going to make a decision other than—other than—leaving Space Command in Colorado, you should delay the decision because nowhere else in America is ready to do the work that needs to be done. Instead, President Trump overturned their recommendation.

As Senator HICKENLOOPER would tell you, that has never happened before in the history of our country, that we can find the President of the United States overrule the recommendation of the generals who knew the subject best. He went on the radio, and he said to these radio hosts in Alabama—which is where Donald Trump preferred to send Space Command for reasons that I suppose only he could know—but he went on a radio show and bragged that he single-handedly had overruled everybody else who had looked at this and said it ought to stay in Colorado, to put it in Alabama instead. The GAO and DOD's own inspector general have confirmed the facts that I just related to you.

Instead of removing the stain of politics, I am sad to say that the Biden administration may be close to ratifying a decision that can't be ratified, a decision that was made in the face of the recommendations of the generals, a decision that was belied by all the relevant facts, and a decision that the GAO, the DOD's own inspector general, and Donald Trump on a radio program all confirmed, which is that politics played into the decision about moving Space Command to Alabama, not the national security interests of the United States.

I know it is easy to think—and I will just confess in front of the pages and everybody else—that it might seem like this is just a parochial interest on the part of the Senators from Colorado because Space Command happens to be in Colorado. I will admit that fact. We have been a great home to Space Command. But I will also say that the months and months and months that we have dedicated, the years that we

have dedicated to analyzing this decision, I think it is fair to say that we are here not representing the parochial interests of our State but representing the national security interests of the United States and the incredible importance of this Biden administration not ratifying a political decision that was made in the last few days of the Trump administration, because decisions of this importance shouldn't be made this way. It should be made in the interests of our national security.

The Biden administration has the opportunity to restore the integrity of this process, and I think if they do restore the integrity of this process, they will find that this Space Command belongs in Colorado, and it shouldn't be moved anywhere else.

I am on the floor today to remind people here of the importance of this issue, the urgency of this issue, not just for Colorado—not even for Colorado—but for the country as a whole and for our national security as a whole. This is a decision that should be made in the interest of the national security of the United States of America, and that decision will lead the Biden administration, I think, to reverse Donald Trump's political decision—a decision that he went on a radio show to advertise for the people of Alabama, demonstrating the political spoil that he was holding up in one hand instead of saying he had done the right thing for the people who work at Space Command and had done the right thing for the mission that we all care about so deeply.

That, in the end, is what the American people, of course, deserve here, because our opponents and our competitors in space are not waiting for us to get out of our own way. It is critically important for us to give the people who are serving in this capacity a sense of security and a sense of stability about what the choice is going to be.

I yield the floor.

#### NOMINATION OF ADRIENNE C. NELSON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote on the nomination of Justice Adrienne Nelson, who has been nominated to the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon.

If confirmed, she will be the first Black woman to serve on the District of Oregon. This will be just one in a history of firsts Justice Nelson has accomplished.

Born in Kansas City, MO, Justice Nelson was the first Black valedictorian at her Arkansas high school post-integration in 1985. She went on to earn her B.A. *summa cum laude* from the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville in 1989 and her J.D. from the University of Texas at Austin in 1993.

Justice Nelson began her legal career at Multnomah Defenders, Inc., a public interest law firm in Portland, OR, representing indigent defendants charged with State crimes for 3 years. She then joined a Portland-area law firm as an associate, where she represented a wide-range of clients, from individuals

to private businesses and labor unions, for 5 years. In 2004, she became the coordinator and senior attorney for the student legal and mediation services at Portland State University. During her time in practice, she tried more than 40 cases, including 25 jury trials.

In 2006, Justice Nelson was appointed to serve as a circuit court judge for the Multnomah County Circuit Court. She presided over approximately 315 cases over 12 years of service on that court.

In 2018, Justice Nelson became the first Black justice to serve on Oregon's highest court. Since then, she has authored 33 majority opinions.

Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY strongly support Justice Nelson's nomination, and the American Bar Association has unanimously rated her "well qualified" to serve on the District of Oregon.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this highly-qualified nominee.

#### VOTE ON REYES NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Reyes nomination?

Mr. KAINE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 20 Ex.]

##### YEAS—51

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Graham	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden

##### NAYS—47

Barrasso	Grassley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeben	Rounds
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Moran	Vance
Daines	Mullin	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Casey	Fetterman
-------	-----------



The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 1, Lester Martinez-Lopez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Tim Kaine, Tammy Baldwin, Ben Ray Lujan, Tammy Duckworth, John W. Hickenlooper, Amy Klobuchar, Jeanne Shaheen, Brian Schatz, Benjamin L. Cardin, Edward J. Markey, Alex Padilla, Margaret Wood Hassan, Catherine Cortez Masto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Lester Martinez-Lopez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 21 Ex.]

#### YEAS—64

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schatz
Booker	Kelly	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Capito	Lujan	Smith
Cardin	Manchin	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Collins	McConnell	Thune
Coons	Menendez	Tillis
Cornyn	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Ernst	Ossoff	Welch
Feinstein	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wicker
Graham	Reed	Wyden
Grassley	Romney	Young
Hassan	Rosen	
Heinrich		

#### NAYS—33

Barrasso	Fischer	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Ricketts
Braun	Hoeven	Risch
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Tuberville
Daines	Marshall	Vance

#### NOT VOTING—3

Casey	Cramer	Fetterman
-------	--------	-----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lester Martinez-Lopez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE 118TH CONGRESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memberships on the twelve subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations for the 118th Congress be printed in the RECORD. I thank my vice chair on the committee, Senator COLLINS, for her leadership and cooperation with me in making these important assignments.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Senator Murray, as Chair of the Committee, and Senator Collins, as Vice Chair of the Committee, are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members.

#### AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Heinrich (chair), Feinstein, Tester, Merkley, Baldwin, Manchin, Peters, Hoeven (ranking member), McConnell, Collins, Moran, Hyde-Smith, and Fischer. (7-6)

#### COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Shaheen (chair), Feinstein, Reed, Coons, Schatz, Manchin, Van Hollen, Merkley, Peters, Moran (ranking member), Murkowski, Collins, Capito, Kennedy, Hagerty, Britt, and Fischer. (9-8)

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Senators Tester (chair), Durbin, Feinstein, Murray, Reed, Schatz, Baldwin, Shaheen, Murphy, Collins (ranking member), McConnell, Murkowski, Graham, Moran, Hoeven, Boozman, and Capito. (9-8)

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

Senators Feinstein (chair), Murray, Tester, Durbin, Shaheen, Merkley, Coons, Baldwin, Heinrich, Kennedy (ranking member), McConnell, Murkowski, Graham, Hoeven, Hyde-Smith, Hagerty, and Britt. (9-8)

#### FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Senators Van Hollen (chair), Durbin, Coons, Manchin, Heinrich, Hagerty (ranking member), Boozman, Kennedy, and Rubio. (5-4)

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Senators Murphy (chair), Murray, Tester, Shaheen, Baldwin, Peters, Britt (ranking member), Murkowski, Capito, Kennedy, and Hyde-Smith. (6-5)

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Merkley (chair), Feinstein, Reed, Tester, Van Hollen, Heinrich, Peters, Murkowski (ranking member), McConnell, Capito, Hoeven, Fischer, and Britt. (7-6)

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Baldwin (chair), Murray, Durbin, Reed, Shaheen, Merkley, Schatz, Murphy, Manchin, Capito (ranking member), Graham, Moran, Kennedy, Hyde-Smith, Boozman, Britt, and Rubio. (9-8)

#### LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senators Reed (chair), Murphy, Van Hollen, Fischer (ranking member), and Rubio. (3-2)

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Murray (chair), Reed, Tester, Schatz, Baldwin, Heinrich, Coons, Manchin, Peters, Boozman (ranking member), McConnell, Murkowski, Hoeven, Collins, Rubio, Hagerty, and Fischer. (9-8)

#### STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Senators Coons (chair), Durbin, Shaheen, Merkley, Murphy, Van Hollen, Schatz, Graham (ranking member), McConnell, Boozman, Moran, Rubio, and Hagerty. (7-6)

#### TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Schatz (chair), Murray, Durbin, Feinstein, Reed, Coons, Murphy, Manchin, Van Hollen, Hyde-Smith (ranking member), Collins, Boozman, Capito, Graham, Hoeven, Kennedy, and Moran. (9-8)

#### TRIBUTE TO WHIDBEY ISLAND PILOTS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Lieutenants



Peggy Dente and Lyndsay Evans of Naval Air Station Whidbey Island for making history on February 12, 2023, as part of the first-ever all-women flyover at the Super Bowl pregame, commemorating 50 years of women serving in the U.S. Navy.

Both of these extraordinary women represent the best of what Washington State—and our Nation—has to offer. Not only do the two share over a decade of friendship, they also bring with them a keen sense of duty and deep commitment to excellence in aviation.

In 1973, eight women broke new ground by being selected for naval aviation training for the first time in our Nation's history. Five decades later, we are seeing more women and girls express interest in taking to the skies through service and leadership at every level of naval aviation. In performing their first ever flyover, Dente and Evans have quite literally proven that with women at the helm, the sky is the limit.

I know breaking into a field dominated by men isn't easy, when I first got to the Senate, there wasn't even a women's bathroom off the Senate floor. But every day, women like Lieutenants Dente and Evans are setting an example for young girls that with hard work, they can follow their dreams and achieve their goals.

I offer my sincere thanks to the lieutenants for their service to our country and my congratulations for proudly representing Washington State on the national stage. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating this tremendous accomplishment.

#### UKRAINE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the media likes narratives that split issues neatly into two opposing positions and often Republican against Democrat.

There is one narrative that has been repeated so often it has become conventional wisdom. It holds that President Biden and Democrats in Congress have been 100 percent committed to opposing Russia's invasion of Ukraine, but Republican support is softening.

That misleading narrative was briefly scrambled when the Congressional Progressive Caucus sent a horribly naive letter calling for President Biden to engage in direct diplomacy with Russia.

Clearly, there are factions on both sides of the aisle hesitant about backing a Ukrainian victory. There is also confusion about who in U.S. politics is most behind Ukraine winning the war.

Let's be clear, the most fervent supporters of victory for Ukraine are Republicans.

Meanwhile, the Biden administration gets credit for being all in for Ukraine, when in fact it is more accurate to say that it is, at best, three-quarters of the way in. And it has been dragged this far by events, public opinion, and some of our bolder European allies.

Speculation about future Republican support for Ukraine is often framed in

terms of Biden's chances to get the aid he might want, but no one asks why President Biden let \$2.2 billion worth of authority passed by Congress to draw down existing weapons for Ukraine expire on September 30 unused.

I have been pleased for the most part with President Biden's rhetorical defense of Ukraine's right to self-defense. But I have been puzzled by some of the delays in sending crucial military aid.

I see signs that the Biden administration is afraid of what will happen if Ukraine is helped to push Russia back into its own borders. It is understandable to be concerned about the risks when dealing with a nuclear armed aggressor. But Putin has backed away from his nuclear saber-rattling in the face of Western resolve. And there are even greater risks in not stopping Russia's aggression now. In fact, in my view, we got where we are now because we acted too timidly in the past. Repeating that mistake now will only invite more aggression in the future.

In early February of 2021, shortly after President Biden took office, I gave a speech wondering whether President Biden's tough-on-Russia rhetoric would be matched by his administration's actions. I reminded the Senate that 12 years earlier, in the early days of the Obama-Biden administration, then-Vice President Biden went to Munich to deliver a speech calling for the United States to hit the "reset button" with Russia. Two years prior to Biden's speech, at the same annual conference, Vladimir Putin had sharply criticized the United States and suggested we were a threat to world peace. Moreover, just 6 months prior to calling for a "reset," Russia had invaded and occupied a significant portion of the Republic of Georgia, which it still occupies to this day.

Calling on the United States to "hit the reset button," as Secretary of State Clinton later symbolically did with Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, strongly suggested that the breakdown in relations with Russia was somehow our fault. President Reagan's Ambassador to the U.N., Jeane Kirkpatrick, famously identified a tendency among some of her fellow Democrats to "blame America first." I put the shameful Obama-Biden Russia reset policy squarely in that tradition. Relations with Russia became bad because Putin saw the United States as an obstacle to his imperial aspirations. That is not our fault. I am concerned that some corners of the Biden administration have not fully dispensed with the naivety behind the so-called Russia reset.

Let's recall just how mistaken the Obama-Biden Russia policy was. Many people remember the arrest of Anna Chapman and nine other deep cover Russian spies living as normal Americans. The FBI had been monitoring this spy network until agents saw signs that Chapman suspected the jig was up. The FBI needed to arrest the whole network before she had a chance to

warn them and they all fled the country.

However, it just so happened that Dmitry Medvedev, the Russian President—at least in name—was in town. Medvedev was meeting with President Obama about all the areas of cooperation between the U.S. and Russia made possible by the reset, plus a photo op eating hamburgers together. To not upset this chummy meeting, the arrests of the Russian spies were postponed until Medvedev was on a plane back to Moscow.

Remember, in order to get around term limits, Vladimir Putin drafted his loyalist, Medvedev, to be the puppet President until Putin could run for President again. This was a transparent shell game. But there was naive hopeful talk that Medvedev was a reformer who might steer Russia in a more democratic, pro-Western direction. Anyone following Medvedev's recent rhetoric about Ukraine knows that is far from true. He remains totally loyal to Putin and has been serving as his rhetorical attack dog.

When Russia invaded and occupied parts of Ukraine in 2014, the Obama administration had angry words for Putin. The reset was on the rocks. But the practical response of the Obama administration was to deny Ukraine defensive weapons, sending only non-lethal aid. President Obama urged Ukraine not to fight to avoid escalation and to settle the matter diplomatically.

Russia has a history of using negotiations to create frozen conflicts. Russia will snatch a piece of land, then demand a ceasefire and negotiations, allowing it to keep the ill-gotten gains indefinitely.

Obviously, maintaining the status quo with Russia occupying parts of Ukraine did not result in a lasting peace. It just led Putin to think he could get away with it again. Perhaps he would have if he hadn't gone big.

Having succeeded in Georgia in 2008 and Ukraine in 2014, Putin figured he might as well go big and grab the whole country. It hasn't worked out for him as he hoped, but he hasn't given up on his initial goals either, even now. Those who had put hope in resetting relations with Russia have been mugged by reality.

But behind the current tough talk, I worry that some in the Biden administration, maybe President Biden himself, still cling to a hope that we can reach an understanding with Putin. Like Jeane Kirkpatrick, who remained a Democrat throughout her service in the Reagan administration, there are many Democrats today who have a clear-eyed view of Russia, including many colleagues in this body. I just wish President Biden would listen to them rather than those in his administration who let concerns about antagonizing Putin keep us from doing everything we can to save Ukrainian lives.

The administration has eventually relented and given Ukraine many

weapons systems it had repeatedly said “no” to. But there are still weapons we could transfer to Ukraine today that would bring the end of the war closer and save lives; yet the administration is refusing because of fear of “escalation.”

We have seen that our HIMARS system has allowed the Ukrainian military to destroy ammunition depots and supply lines, making it possible for the Ukrainians to liberate significant territory. We have seen the videos of Ukrainian soldiers greeted with tears of joy by liberated civilians who have endured brutal Russian occupation.

However, we did not transfer the HIMARS until June, months into the war. And we denied the Ukrainians longer range missiles for the HIMARS. There are reports that we even modified the systems before delivery to make sure they could not shoot longer range missiles. This is apparently based on a misguided concern about threatening Russian territory.

Recently, the Biden administration has announced it will send Ukraine the ground-launched small-diameter bomb, which is double the range of the current HIMARS rockets, but which still fall far short of the range of the Army Tactical Missile System that Ukraine has been asking for.

Despite its success in retaking some of its own territory, Russia cannot seriously claim to be concerned about a Ukrainian invasion. Ukraine is the one that is being brutally invaded and occupied by Russia. And Ukraine has every right under international law to target Russian bases from which Russia is launching missiles at electrical plants and apartment buildings. Moreover, as the Lithuanian Prime Minister pointed out on her most recent visit to the United States, Ukraine needs these longer range missiles to attack Russian positions inside Ukraine itself.

The most clear-eyed leadership about the war is coming from those who know Russia the best, like the leaders of our Baltic allies. When Americans see Iranian-made drones and Russian cruise missiles crashing into apartment buildings, killing old women and young children, our hearts break. But knowing that many of these attacks are being launched from Russian-occupied Crimea, within range of the missiles we have been denying to Ukraine, makes the death and destruction even more heartbreaking.

The more advanced weapons Ukraine can obtain quickly, the faster the war will end. The U.S. and many of our allies have now announced delivery of tanks to Ukraine, something previously off the table. But it isn't clear if this decision was taken in time for the tanks to arrive in sufficient quantity to play a role in a spring counter-offensive or to help Ukraine defend against Russia's renewed offensive efforts, which are underway now. We should not be afraid of Ukraine winning.

President Macron of France has expressed concern about humiliating

Putin. It is true that a defeated Putin would be dangerous, but a victorious Putin would surely be even more dangerous. Precisely because Russia has long been dangerous, we have built up military stockpiles in case we need to defend our allies in Europe from a possible attack by Russia.

Some of those stockpiles are now being used very effectively to degrade the Russian military and the threat it poses. This is being done by the Ukrainian military without a single American soldier in battle.

Some people have expressed concerns that we could give too much military aid, reducing what we need in case we have to fight a war. Obviously, we need to ensure our own potential defense needs are taken care of. I have been following closely what we have left and what we have given. Our military stockpiles are not public, but I can say that do not see any cause for alarm. Keep in mind that the level of stocks our military has determined we need is based on possibly having to fight the Russian military, but the Russian military as it existed before the full scale invasion on February 24. Since the Ukrainians have significantly diminished the Russian military, the threat to the United States is greatly reduced. So our requirements for ammunition and equipment are also now also lower.

The Russian war against Ukraine has also shaken us from our peacetime complacency about the state of our defense industrial base. Efforts are now underway to rejuvenate our ability to replenish our stockpiles of arms and ammunition. This will help not only with our efforts to aid Ukraine, but will greatly improve U.S. readiness to deal with potential threats in the near future, such as from China. There are also understandable concerns about the cost to the American taxpayers of replacing the equipment given to Ukraine.

Aside from the fact that some of this would be replaced with upgraded versions soon anyway, the cost benefit of a Ukrainian soldier destroying a Russian tank with one of our Javelins is enormous. The Russian military is being destroyed for pennies on the dollar and zero cost in American blood. Then just think of what the cost in American blood and treasure would be if Russia did attack one of our NATO allies.

And make no mistake, Russia's imperial ambitions do not stop with part, or even all of Ukraine. Estonia's Prime Minister often points out “If Putin wins, or if he even has the view that he has won this war, his appetite will only grow.” That is exactly what happened after Russia's invasion of Georgia in 2008 and Ukraine in 2014.

Putin's background is in the overlapping world of the KGB and Russian organized crime. In that world, only strength is respected, and weakness invites aggression. Let's not repeat past mistakes. Preventing future Russian aggression will greatly enhance Amer-

ican security and avoid major costs down the road. That makes it in America's national interest to support a decisive Ukrainian victory as soon as possible.

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, the Committee on Environment and Public Works has adopted rules governing its procedures for the 118th Congress. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### RULES OF PROCEDURE

#### RULE 1. COMMITTEE MEETINGS IN GENERAL

(a) Regular Meeting Days: For purposes of complying with paragraph 3 of Senate Rule XXVI, the regular meeting day of the committee is the first and third Wednesday of each month at 10:00 a.m. If there is no business before the committee, the regular meeting shall be omitted.

(b) Additional Meetings: The chair may call additional meetings, after consulting with the ranking minority member. Subcommittee chairs may call meetings, with the concurrence of the chair, after consulting with the ranking minority members of the subcommittee and the committee.

(c) Presiding Officer:

(1) The chair shall preside at all meetings of the committee. If the chair is not present, the ranking majority member shall preside.

(2) Subcommittee chairs shall preside at all meetings of their subcommittees. If the subcommittee chair is not present, the ranking majority member of the subcommittee shall preside.

(3) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by paragraphs (1) and (2), any member of the committee may preside at a hearing.

(d) Open Meetings: Meetings of the committee and subcommittees, including hearings and business meetings, are open to the public. A portion of a meeting may be closed to the public if the committee determines by roll call vote of a majority of the members present that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure; or

(3) constitute any other grounds for closure under paragraph 5(b) of Senate Rule XXVI.

(e) Broadcasting:

(1) Public meetings of the committee or a subcommittee may be televised, broadcast, or recorded by a member of the Senate press gallery or an employee of the Senate.

(2) Any member of the Senate Press Gallery or employee of the Senate wishing to televise, broadcast, or record a committee meeting must notify the staff director or the staff director's designee by 5:00 p.m. the day before the meeting.

(3) During public meetings, any person using a camera, microphone, or other electronic equipment may not position or use the equipment in a way that interferes with the seating, vision, or hearing of committee

members or staff on the dais, or with the orderly process of the meeting.

#### RULE 2. QUORUMS

(a) Business Meetings: At committee business meetings, and for the purpose of approving the issuance of a subpoena or approving a committee resolution, seven members of the committee, at least two of whom are members of the minority party, constitute a quorum, except as provided in subsection (d).

(b) Subcommittee Meetings: At subcommittee business meetings, a majority of the subcommittee members, at least one of whom is a member of the minority party, constitutes a quorum for conducting business.

(c) Continuing Quorum: Once a quorum as prescribed in subsections (a) and (b) has been established, the committee or subcommittee may continue to conduct business.

(d) Reporting: No measure or matter may be reported to the Senate by the committee unless a majority of committee members cast votes in person.

(e) Hearings: One member constitutes a quorum for conducting a hearing.

#### RULE 3. HEARINGS

(a) Announcements: Before the committee or a subcommittee holds a hearing, the chair of the committee or subcommittee shall make a public announcement and provide notice to members of the date, place, time, and subject matter of the hearing. The announcement and notice shall be issued at least one week in advance of the hearing, unless the chair of the committee or subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee, determines that there is good cause to provide a shorter period, in which event the announcement and notice shall be issued at least twenty-four hours in advance of the hearing.

(b) Statements of Witnesses:

(1) A witness who is scheduled to testify at a hearing of the committee or a subcommittee shall file the written testimony by electronic mail at least 48 hours before the hearing. If a witness fails to comply with this requirement, the presiding officer may preclude the witness' testimony. This rule may be waived for field hearings, except for witnesses from the Federal Government.

(2) Any witness planning to use at a hearing any exhibit such as a chart, graph, diagram, photo, map, slide, video, or model must submit by electronic mail or other means one identical copy of the exhibit (or representation of the exhibit in the case of a model) at least 48 hours before the hearing. Any exhibit described above that is not provided to the committee at least 48 hours prior to the hearing cannot be used for purpose of presenting testimony to the committee and will not be included in the hearing record.

(3) The presiding officer at a hearing may have a witness confine the oral presentation to a summary of the written testimony.

(4) Notwithstanding a request that a document be embargoed, any document that is to be discussed at a hearing, including, but not limited to, those produced by the General Accounting Office, Congressional Budget Office, Congressional Research Service, a Federal agency, an Inspector General, or a non-governmental entity, shall be provided to all members of the committee at least 72 hours before the hearing.

#### RULE 4. BUSINESS MEETINGS: NOTICE AND FILING REQUIREMENTS

(a) Notice: The chair of the committee or the subcommittee shall provide notice, the agenda of business to be discussed, and the text of agenda items to members of the committee or subcommittee at least 72 hours be-

fore a business meeting. If the 72 hours falls over a weekend, all materials will be provided by close of business on Friday.

(b) Amendments: First-degree amendments must be filed with the chair of the committee or the subcommittee at least 24 hours before a business meeting. After the filing deadline, the chair shall promptly distribute all filed amendments to the members of the committee or subcommittee.

(c) Modifications: The chair of the committee or the subcommittee may modify the notice and filing requirements to meet special circumstances, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member of the committee or subcommittee.

#### RULE 5. BUSINESS MEETINGS: VOTING

(a) Proxy Voting:

(1) Proxy voting is allowed on all measures, amendments, resolutions, or other matters before the committee or a subcommittee.

(2) A member who is unable to attend a business meeting may submit a proxy vote on any matter, in writing, orally, or through personal instructions.

(3) A proxy given in writing is valid until revoked. A proxy given orally or by personal instructions is valid only on the day given.

(b) Subsequent Voting: Members who were not present at a business meeting and were unable to cast their votes by proxy may record their votes later, so long as they do so that same business day and their vote does not change the outcome.

(c) Public Announcement:

(1) Whenever the committee conducts a rollcall vote, the chair shall announce the results of the vote, including a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast against the proposition by each member of the committee.

(2) Whenever the committee reports any measure or matter by rollcall vote, the report shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to the measure or matter by each member of the committee.

#### RULE 6. SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Regularly Established Subcommittees: The committee has four subcommittees: Transportation and Infrastructure; Clean Air, Climate, and Nuclear Safety; Chemical Safety, Waste Management, Environmental Justice, and Regulatory Oversight; and Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife.

(b) Membership: The committee chair, after consulting with the ranking minority member, shall select members of the subcommittees.

#### RULE 7. STATUTORY RESPONSIBILITIES AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) Environmental Impact Statements: No project or legislation proposed by any executive branch agency may be approved or otherwise acted upon unless the committee has received a final environmental impact statement relative to it, in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, and the written comments of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in accordance with section 309 of the Clean Air Act. This rule is not intended to broaden, narrow, or otherwise modify the class of projects or legislative proposals for which environmental impact statements are required under section 102(2)(C).

(b) Project Approvals:

(1) Whenever the committee authorizes a project under Public Law 89-298, the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965; Public Law 83-566, the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; or Public Law 86-249, the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; the chairman shall submit for printing in the Con-

gressional Record, and the committee shall publish periodically as a committee print, a report that describes the project and the reasons for its approval, together with any dissenting or individual views.

(2) Proponents of a committee resolution shall submit appropriate evidence in favor of the resolution.

(c) Building Prospectuses:

(1) When the General Services Administration submits a prospectus, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, for construction (including construction of buildings for lease by the government), alteration and repair, or acquisition, the committee shall act with respect to the prospectus during the same session in which the prospectus is submitted.

A prospectus rejected by majority vote of the committee or not reported to the Senate during the session in which it was submitted shall be returned to the General Services Administration and must then be resubmitted in order to be considered by the committee during the next session of the Congress.

(2) A report of a building project survey submitted by the General Services Administration to the committee under section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, may not be considered by the committee as being a prospectus subject to approval by committee resolution in accordance with section 7(a) of that Act. A project described in the report may be considered for committee action only if it is submitted as a prospectus in accordance with section 7(a) and is subject to the provisions of paragraph (1) of this rule.

(d) Naming Public Facilities: The committee may not name a building, structure or facility for any living person, except former Presidents or former Vice Presidents of the United States, former Members of Congress over 70 years of age, former Justices of the United States Supreme Court over 70 years of age, or Federal judges who are fully retired and over 75 years of age or have taken senior status and are over 75 years of age.

#### RULE 8. AMENDING THE RULES

The rules may be added to, modified, amended, or suspended by vote of a majority of committee members at a business meeting if a quorum is present.

### ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
WASHINGTON, DC.

CHAIRMAN,  
*Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 23-05 concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Kuwait for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$250 million. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,  
*Director.*

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 23-05

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Kuwait.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment\* \$0 million.

Other \$250 million.

Total \$250 million.

Funding Source: National Funds

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of Kuwait has requested to buy planning, integration, implementation, and maintenance of a Medical Information System for their Kuwait Military Medical Command (KMMC) that consists of:

MDE: None.

Non-MDE: Health Information Systems (HIS) Information Technology (IT) hardware and software, IT infrastructure, implementation of life-cycle management practices, training, maintenance, support and warranty services, along with U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (KU-B-UXY).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: February 14, 2023.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Kuwait—Medical Information System for Kuwait Military Medical Command (KMMC)

The Government of Kuwait has requested to buy planning, integration, implementation, and maintenance of a Medical Information System for its Kuwait Military Medical Command (KMMC) that consists of: Health Information Systems Information Technology (IT) hardware and software, IT infrastructure, implementation of life-cycle management practices, training, maintenance, support and warranty services, along with U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support. The estimated total cost is \$250 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the infrastructure of a Major Non-NATO ally that has been and continues to be an important force for political stability and economic progress in the Middle East.

This proposed sale will improve Kuwait's capability to provide greater health security for its KMMC infrastructure. Kuwait will use the enhanced capability to strengthen its medical services management. Kuwait will have no difficulty absorbing this infrastructure, support, and associated services into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be the Cerner Corporation, Kansas City, Missouri. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require the assignment of as many as fifteen (15) additional U.S. Government or U.S. contractor representatives to Kuwait for a duration of up to seven (7) years to provide systems planning, implementation, management, and oversight.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BRIAN D'ISERNIA

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Brian D'Isernia as he retires from a distinguished 53-year career as a lawyer, fisherman, sailor, and shipbuilder at Eastern Shipbuilding Group of Panama City, FL.

Brian graduated from Georgetown University with a bachelor's degree in economics and a law degree from Fordham University School of Law. He passed the New York State Bar, practicing for a few years before changing careers and opening his commercial fishing enterprise out of New Bedford, MA.

Operating his commercial fishing business for 8 years, it eventually grew to become a vessel construction shipyard. Constructing fishing boats allowed Brian to design fishing vessels his way. These designs quickly drew the attention of other professionals in the boating industry, and customers soon contacted Eastern Shipbuilding Group from across the Nation.

By the 1980s, Brian's reputation was that his shipyard could fulfill any custom vessel request. Today, Eastern Shipbuilding Group's vessel portfolio consists of more than 350 vessels, with many used by commercial fishermen and the U.S. Coast Guard. His work was recognized in 2017 by receiving the National Maritime Historical Society's Distinguished Service Award.

Brian's work over the decades has made a lasting impact on the boating industry. As he embarks on his new retirement journey, Eastern Shipbuilding remains a family-owned and operated business led by the next generation of his family.

I extend my best wishes to Brian, his wife Miriam, their children, and grandchildren.●

REMEMBERING DANNY KALEIKINI

• Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, with the passing of Danny Kaleikini, Hawai'i

has lost a legend. An incredibly talented musician and a wonderfully kind individual, Danny was a living embodiment of the aloha spirit, someone who represented the very best of Hawai'i.

Danny grew up on O'ahu, one of eight kids in a two-bedroom house. He started selling newspapers at 6 years old and found an early passion for music, learning to sing and play the trumpet and drums. After high school, he pursued a career in music—and in 1967, at just 29 years old, landed a twice-a-night show at the Kahala Hilton.

But Danny wasn't content just having a show. A savvy promoter, he would traverse Waikiki during the day, 'ukulele player and hula dancer in tow, promoting that night's performance. And an astute businessman, he oversaw the managing, staging, and producing of it—becoming one of the first musicians to offer VHS tapes of shows.

For nearly 30 years, Danny took the stage 6-to-7 nights a week, performing more than 10,000 times in Honolulu, as well as at Carnegie Hall in New York, Caesars Palace in Las Vegas, and across Japan. He earned a Guinness book of records nomination, and a Lifetime Achievement Award from the Hawai'i Academy of Recording Arts. He even dabbled in acting, appearing in "Hawai'i Five-O" and in the 1970 movie "The Hawaiians," where he arrested Charlton Heston.

But while his talent was undeniable, what set Danny apart was an unparalleled, infectious enthusiasm. Danny learned greetings in dozens of languages and enjoyed connecting with people from across the world. As another Hawai'i legend, comedian Andy Bumatai, once said, "if aliens landed at the Hilton, Danny would greet them in their own language."

Danny lived a life of joy, generosity, and aloha. His voice, warmth, and spirit will be well remembered and greatly missed. My thoughts and deepest sympathies are with his family and all those who loved him.

May he rest in peace and aloha. And may his spirit live on.●

MEASURES PLACED ON THE  
CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 424. A bill to protect the seniors of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF  
COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nomination of Col. Leigh A. Swanson, to be Brigadier General.

\*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Sean A. Gainey, to be Lieutenant General.

\*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Heidi J. Hoyle, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Laurence S. Linton, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Stacy M. Babcock and ending with Col. Peggy R. McManus, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 23, 2023.

\*Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Andrew J. Gebara, to be Lieutenant General.

\*Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Robert M. Collins, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Natalie D. Richardson, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Jonathan M. Bise, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Nathan K. Aiken, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Jovon A. Williams, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Bryan W. Sixkiller, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Laciresha A. Merkle, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Justin T. Schneider, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Jeffrey S. Clark, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Alicia K. Premo, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with David A. Alt and ending with Richard M. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 2, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brant Adams and ending with Jessica E. Zhen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 2, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Phillip C. Barras and ending with Marita N. Zguri, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 2, 2023.

Air Force nominations beginning with Khashayar Azimi and ending with Yangdi Zhou, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 2, 2023.

Army nomination of William T. Johnson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Eric J. Kunkle, to be Major.

Army nomination of William E. McCarville, to be Major.

Army nomination of Leslie A. McCampbell, to be Major.

Army nomination of Hardy P. Merrill, to be Major.

Army nomination of D011285, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Lajohnne A. Morris and ending with Jennifer A. Parker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Army nomination of Yulang Tsou, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Blaire R. Griffin, to be Major.

Army nomination of Timothy J. Maki, to be Major.

Army nomination of Russell W. Vanderlugt, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Brian J. Slotnick, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Jessica L. Horne, to be Major.

Army nomination of John R. Taylor, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jason L. Norquist, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Queschae B. Blue-Clark and ending with Vincent P. Wolff, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Army nomination of Michael B. Cohen, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Irene Garcia, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Yong J. Lee, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Mahealani N. McFarland, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Clayton A. Sutton, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Kevin M. Adams and ending with D016440, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher M. Kientz and ending with Victor A. Mercado, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Adam D. Akers and ending with Stacey N. Wuchter, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Jesse R. Chapin and ending with John R. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Army nomination of Brendan T. McShea, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Matthew R. Burmeister, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Jessica K. Smyth, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Megan L. Jimenez and ending with Steve B. Louvet, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Army nomination of Brendon M. Esquibel, to be Major.

Army nomination of Apoorv Vohra, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher W. Swiecki and ending with Joel C. Webb, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 2, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Robert J. Bell, Jr. and ending with Trevor C. Thibodeau, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nomination of John C. Jarvis, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Andres J. Agramonte and ending with Timothy G. Otto, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Robert A. Lien and ending with Timothy E. Sapp, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Kevin F. Champaigne and ending with Edwin E. Rodriguez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nomination of Duane A. Gumbs, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Richard P. Charest and ending with Keith C. Datiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nomination of Aaron S. Ellis, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Michael P. Ruegger and ending with Todd J. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Patrick J. Abbott and ending with Joseph C. Zwierzynski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Adalberto Castro II and ending with Justin W. Rehm, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Vincent S. Ginestra and ending with John M. Rydman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Jonathan J. Butler and ending with Joshua O. Stewart, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Dustin A. Hamm and ending with Lucas A. Tuning II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Scott M. Carter and ending with James P. Otto, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Branden D. Palmer and ending with Bryant Wall, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Joshua Adornorivera and ending with Matthew J. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nomination of Jeffrey Tang, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Robert W. Kreuger III, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with David K. Coker and ending with Jessy W. Phillips, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with James D. Ballard, Jr. and ending with Craig A. Rooth, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Fadi S. Abdelhalim and ending with Joseph A. Ortiz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Bradley C. Kirby and ending with Bryan D. Stinger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Marine Corps nomination of William D. Hawkins, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Joussef J. Abchidonado and ending with Adam T. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael Holifield and ending with Stuart Kirkby, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2023.

Navy nomination of Martin L. Leonard, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of James E. Hammond, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Mario J. Cardoso, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Brett W. Sadowski, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Leland H. Sebring III, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Beau D. Hufstetler, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Kimberly Francis, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Wisdom K. Henyo, to be Lieutenant Commander.

By Mr. SANDERS for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

\*Karia Ann Gilbride, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term of four years.

\*LaWanda Amaker Toney, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary for Communications and Outreach, Department of Education.

\*Glenna Laureen Wright-Gallo, of Nevada, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 426. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and provide an inflation adjustment for the limitation on distributions from qualified tuition programs that may be used for elementary and secondary tuition; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mrs. BRITT):

S. 427. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Labor from constraining the range or type of investments that may be offered to participants and beneficiaries of individual retirement accounts who exercise control over the assets in such accounts; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 428. A bill to amend title 41, United States Code, to prohibit the Federal Government from entering into contracts with an entity that discriminates against firearm or ammunition industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. MULLIN):

S. 429. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an abandoned wells research, development, and demonstration program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 430. A bill to provide authority to enter into a cooperative agreement to protect civilians in Iraq and the Arabian Peninsula from weaponized unmanned aerial systems; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. THUNE, Mr. LEE, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 431. A bill to withhold United States contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 432. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Nulhegan River and Paul Stream in the State of Vermont for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 433. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to convene a blue ribbon panel to review the forest inventory and analysis program of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. RISCH, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 434. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to modify requirements under that Act relating to exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. TUBERVILLE, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 435. A bill to provide requirements related to the eligibility of individuals who identify as transgender from serving in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 436. A bill to respond to the looming global food crisis precipitated by Russia's invasion of Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 437. A bill to establish within the Office of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment of the United States Agency for International Development a rural mobility program to promote mobility in rural communities through access to affordable, fit-for-purpose bicycles, provide support to sustainably increase access to rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 438. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to provide for expanded natural gas exports; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 439. A bill to amend chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, to prohibit transactions involving certain financial instruments by Members of Congress; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 440. A bill to designate certain land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service in the State of Oregon as wilderness and national recreation

areas, to withdraw certain land located in Curry County and Josephine County, Oregon, from all forms of entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws, location, entry, and patent under the mining laws, and operation under the mineral leasing and geothermal leasing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 441. A bill to establish American opportunity accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mrs. BRITT):

S. 442. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit former Presidential appointees from acting on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of China, the Chinese Communist Party, and Chinese military companies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 443. A bill to treat certain liquidations of new motor vehicle inventory as qualified liquidations of LIFO inventory for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. TUBERVILLE):

S. 444. A bill to require any convention, agreement, or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response reached by the World Health Assembly to be subject to Senate ratification; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 445. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue a final rule relating to removing the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem population of grizzly bears from the Federal list of endangered and threatened wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 446. A bill to provide the President with authority to enter into certain plurilateral trade agreements with benefits only applying to signatories of those agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.



By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WICKER, Ms. SINEMA, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 447. A bill to establish a demonstration program for the active remediation of orbital debris and to require the development of uniform orbital debris standard practices in order to support a safe and sustainable orbital environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KING, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 448. A bill to codify the existing Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Program of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 449. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the assignment of patient advocates at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 450. A bill to strengthen export controls for emerging and foundational technologies that bolster the destabilizing activities of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 451. A bill to impose sanctions and establish strict conditions on the termination of sanctions in response to acts of aggression by the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Russian Federation against the people of Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 452. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a Nuclear Fuel Security Program, expand the American Assured Fuel Supply Program, and submit a report on a civil nuclear credit program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. VANCE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 453. A bill to prohibit the implementation of new requirements to report bank account deposits and withdrawals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 454. A bill to establish a competitive grant program to support out-of-school-time youth workforce readiness programs, providing employability skills development, career exploration, employment readiness training, mentoring, work-based learning, and workforce opportunities for eligible youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LEE, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 455. A bill to terminate the requirement imposed by the Director of the Centers for

Disease Control and Prevention for proof of COVID-19 vaccination for foreign travelers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 456. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize non-medical counseling services, provided by certain mental health professionals, to military families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 457. A bill to establish a Federal tort against pediatric gender clinics and other entities pushing gender-transition procedures that cause bodily injury to children or harm the mental health of children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 458. A bill to establish a program to reduce the reliance of allied and partner nations on natural gas, petroleum, nuclear fuel, and minerals produced in Russia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. BUDD):

S. 459. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for convicted murderers who kill or target America's public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. MULLIN):

S. 460. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to establish an urban Indian organization confer policy for the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. Res. 65. A resolution opposing a national sales tax on working families and supporting a tax cut to benefit the middle class; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KELLY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COONS, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. Res. 66. A resolution condemning the use by the People's Republic of China of a high-altitude surveillance balloon over the territory of the United States as a brazen violation of United States sovereignty; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BUDD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CAR-

PER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VANCE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 67. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Career and Technical Education Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. Res. 68. A resolution designating the week of February 11 through February 18, 2023, as "National Entrepreneurship Week" to recognize the importance and contributions of entrepreneurs and startups to the economic prosperity of the United States and the well-being of every community across the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. VANCE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. KELLY):

S. Res. 69. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 18 through February 25, 2023, as "National FFA Week", recognizing the important role of the National FFA Organization in developing the next generation of globally conscious leaders who will change the world and in celebration of the 95th anniversary of the National FFA Organization; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. Res. 70. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 1, 2023, as "George Washington Carver Day"; considered and agreed to.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 10

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 10, a bill to improve the workforce of the



Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 112

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S. 112, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to strengthen benefits for children of Vietnam veterans born with spina bifida, and for other purposes.

S. 132

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 132, a bill to require a pilot program on activities under the pre-separation transition process of members of the Armed Forces for a reduction in suicide among veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 179

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 179, a bill to require the designation of composting as a conservation practice and activity, to provide grants and loan guarantees for composting facilities and programs, and for other purposes.

S. 325

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 325, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices and judges of the courts of the United States, establish an ethics investigations counsel, and require disclosure of recusals.

S. 363

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 363, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the individuals and communities who volunteered or donated items to the North Platte Canteen in North Platte, Nebraska, during World War II from December 25, 1941, to April 1, 1946.

S. 370

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to amend section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to ensure that efforts to engage in espionage or technology transfer are considered in visa issuance, and for other purposes.

S. 381

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 381, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to include a criminal penalty and a ground of removability for financing the un-

lawful entry of an alien into the United States.

S. CON. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 2, a concurrent resolution commending the bravery, courage, and resolve of the women and men of Iran demonstrating in more than 133 cities and risking their safety to speak out against the Iranian regime's human rights abuses.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. RISCH, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 434. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to modify requirements under that Act relating to exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to print my bill for introduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The bill amends the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, to modify requirements under that act relating to exemptions.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 434

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Preventing Adversary Influence, Disinformation, and Obscured Foreign Financing Act of 2023" or the "PAID OFF Act of 2023".

### SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF EXEMPTIONS UNDER FARA.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) The term 'country of concern' means—

"(1) the People's Republic of China;

"(2) the Russian Federation;

"(3) the Islamic Republic of Iran;

"(4) the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

"(5) the Republic of Cuba; and

"(6) the Syrian Arab Republic."

(b) EXEMPTIONS.—Section 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 613), is amended, in the matter preceding subsection (a), by inserting "except that the exemptions under subsections (d)(1) and (h) shall not apply to any agent of a foreign principal that is a country of concern" before the colon.

(c) SUNSET.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall terminate on October 1, 2026.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 437. A bill to establish within the Office of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment of the United States Agency for International Development a rural mobility program to promote mobility in rural communities through access to affordable, fit-for-purpose bicycles, provide support to sustainably

increase access to rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 437

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Bicycles for Rural African Transport Act".

### SEC. 2. RURAL MOBILITY PROGRAM IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this Act as "USAID") shall establish, within the Office of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, a rural mobility program (referred to in this section as the "Program") to carry out the purposes described in paragraph (2), including through grants made to eligible nongovernmental partner organizations, prioritizing those organizations with demonstrated success conducting rural mobility programs in the region to so carry out such purposes.

(2) PURPOSE.—The Program shall focus on country-driven projects within sub-Saharan Africa—

(A) to promote rural communities' access to critical services and opportunities, including education, health care, and livelihood opportunities, through access to affordable, fit-for-purpose bicycles; and

(B) to provide support to sustainably increase access to critical services, such as education, health care, and livelihood opportunities in rural areas, including through support for rural-based mechanics, access to spare parts, reduction of social and gender-based stigma, and community project management capacity.

(3) PARTNERSHIPS.—To the greatest extent practicable, the Program shall partner with existing entities overseas that have successful models for providing access to affordable bicycles to achieve development objectives.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated—

(A) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2024;

(B) \$3,000,000 for fiscal year 2025;

(C) \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2026;

(D) \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2027; and

(E) \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 2028 and for each fiscal year thereafter.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) PRIOR PROJECTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of USAID shall submit a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives regarding projects carried out by USAID during each of the fiscal years 2020, 2021, 2022, and 2023 relating to the purposes described in subsection (a)(2). The report shall—

(A) identify in which countries USAID embedded rural bicycle mobility into strategies, programs, and projects of USAID;

(B) describe the mechanisms by which rural bicycle mobility was so embedded;

(C) specify the number of bicycles distributed each fiscal year;

(D) assess the outcomes for and impacts on participants in such projects; and

(E) assess USAID's efforts to disseminate lessons learned from such projects.

(2) **CURRENT PROJECTS.**—Not later than December 30, 2025, and not later than each December 30 thereafter, the Administrator of USAID shall submit a report to the congressional committees listed in paragraph (1) regarding projects carried out by USAID during the immediately preceding fiscal year. Each such report shall include information relating to the matters described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (1).

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KING, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 448. A bill to codify the existing Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Program of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to introduce the bipartisan Outdoors for All Act. This legislation would ensure that access to local parks and outdoor recreation is equitable and available to all.

The Outdoors for All Act would codify and strengthen the Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Program at the Interior Department, which provides grants to build new outdoor recreation spaces, improve existing parks, and form connections between underserved, urban communities and the outdoors.

It specifically invests in parks and open spaces in areas where the majority of Americans live. Any single urban area or two adjacent urban areas with a population of at least 25,000 can qualify for grants, which can benefit residents in all 50 States.

These grants would fund projects in park-poor, urban communities, and the bill would require the National Park Service to prioritize projects that support underserved communities, provide job-training to youth, and leverage resources through public-private partnerships.

As our cities grow and the effects of climate change intensify, this bill will increase equitable access to the many benefits of local parks, from job creation, to shade and tree cover, the reduction of the urban heat island effect, and clean air.

Nationwide, 100 million people, including 28 million children, do not have a park within a half-mile of home. That is almost one-third of America.

Additionally, in the 100 most populated cities, neighborhoods where most residents identify as Black, Latino, American Indian/Alaska Native, or Asian American and Pacific Islander have access to an average of 44 percent less park acreage than predominantly White neighborhoods.

For example, in Los Angeles, low-income communities and communities of

color lack equal access to parks—a Los Angeles County survey found that Compton reported only 0.6 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, in contrast to Malibu, which has 55.5 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents.

This bill would address this staggering inequity in Los Angeles and across the country and make equity and justice a key focus of park investment and planning.

I thank Senator COLLINS for introducing this legislation with me in the Senate and Congresswoman BARRAGÁN and Congressman TURNER for leading this effort in the House of Representatives.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the Outdoors for All Act soon as possible.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. BUDD):

S. 459. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide enhanced penalties for convicted murderers who kill or target America's public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, Indiana has lost several officers in the line of duty in the last 2 years, like Terre Haute Officer Greg Ferency and Richmond Officer Seara Burton.

I would like to say a few words about Elwood Police Officer Noah Shahnnavaz, who was killed in the line of duty last year in a little town in Indiana. He was only 24 years old. He was shot during a routine traffic stop by a violent career criminal who should have been behind bars. His parents, Laurie and Matt, remembered their son to my office with these words:

All that Noah ever wanted to do is help others. Society has been robbed of the many positive impacts he would have had on our world.

When a police officer is killed in the line of duty, it sends a shock wave through the community, and it is happening in far too many places.

I decided after his death that I wanted to take the lead in reintroducing the Thin Blue Line Act. This bill would make targeting police officers an aggravating factor in favor of the maximum sentence. It has already passed through the House of Representatives once before. We need to do it again in this Congress and get it through the Senate as well.

Supporting our police shouldn't be a partisan issue. This law wouldn't apply in every case, but it would make criminals think twice before targeting our police. We have to do everything we can to protect those who protect us. The one thing we could do to fight back against crime is to support those on the frontline. We need to give them the resources they need and send a clear message to those who wish to do them harm: If you target a police offi-

cer, you are going to pay the highest price possible.

We need to get that done.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 65—OPPOSING A NATIONAL SALES TAX ON WORKING FAMILIES AND SUPPORTING A TAX CUT TO BENEFIT THE MIDDLE CLASS

Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mr. KAINE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 65

Whereas hardworking families have faced significant economic challenges over the past few years, including high gas prices, rising costs for groceries, and increasing rent and home prices due to record-high inflation;

Whereas elected leaders should be working to relieve individuals in the United States of the financial pressure at the kitchen table, and pass legislation that brings down costs rather than raises prices;

Whereas Republicans in Congress have introduced and plan to consider H.R. 25, the FairTax Act of 2023, which would impose a new national sales tax and increase the price of all goods and services by 30 percent;

Whereas, under this legislation, it is estimated that, for a family in the United States—

(1) the average yearly grocery bill would rise by \$3,500;

(2) the cost of buying a car would go up \$10,000; and

(3) the cost of buying a home would increase by \$125,000;

Whereas the price increases brought on by the FairTax Act of 2023 would disproportionately impact retirees, seniors, and those living on a fixed income by raising prices on individuals whose incomes will remain flat as prices rise;

Whereas this misguided legislation, which places a financial burden on seniors and hardworking families, also eliminates all income taxes for the ultra-rich;

Whereas in recent years, Republicans in Congress have given massive tax cuts to billionaires and giant corporations at the expense of middle class families;

Whereas Republicans in Congress have suggested paying for past tax cuts for corporations and the ultra-wealthy by cutting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid;

Whereas Democrats in Congress passed the largest middle class tax cut in generations through the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (Public Law 117-2; 135 Stat. 4), which expanded the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit, cutting child poverty nearly in half in 2021; and

Whereas individuals in the United States deserve real bipartisan tax reform and a simpler, fairer tax code aimed at supporting the middle class: Now therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) strongly opposes H.R. 25, the FairTax Act of 2023, which would impose an effective 30 percent sales tax on all goods and services, raising prices for hardworking families, seniors, and other individuals in the United States working to make ends meet;

(2) supports the passage of a responsible tax cut that would actually benefit hardworking families and grow the middle class,

while making the ultra-wealthy and billion-dollar corporations pay their fair share; and

(3) opposes paying for any tax cuts with cuts to Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid, or cuts to pay and benefits for our servicemembers, veterans, or law enforcement.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 66—CONDEMNING THE USE BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA OF A HIGH-ALTITUDE SURVEILLANCE BALLOON OVER THE TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES AS A BRAZEN VIOLATION OF UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY**

Mr. TESTER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KELLY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COONS, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 66

Whereas, on February 2, 2023, the Department of Defense publicly announced it was tracking over United States territory a high-altitude surveillance balloon belonging to the People's Republic of China (PRC);

Whereas the Department of Defense acknowledged that North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) first began tracking the surveillance balloon on January 28, 2023, prior to the entry of the balloon into United States airspace;

Whereas the Secretary of Defense has stated that the balloon "was being used by the PRC in an attempt to surveil strategic sites in the continental United States";

Whereas the surveillance balloon traveled near sensitive national security facilities of the United States, including Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana;

Whereas, on February 4, 2023, a United States Air Force aircraft, at the direction of the President acting consistent with military advice, shot down the surveillance balloon in the territorial airspace of the United States off the coast of South Carolina;

Whereas, on February 4, 2023, the Department of Defense submitted a request for a call between the Secretary of Defense and the Minister of National Defense of the PRC, Wei Fenghe, a request that the PRC subsequently declined;

Whereas open lines of communication between the United States and the civilian and military officials of the PRC remain critical to avoid miscommunication or escalation to conflict;

Whereas the United States intelligence community has linked the surveillance balloon of the PRC to a broader surveillance program run by the People's Liberation Army, and United States officials have briefed officials from other countries that may have also been targeted;

Whereas intelligence collection by the PRC directed against the United States poses a threat to the interests and security of the United States and extends beyond the capabilities demonstrated by the February 2023 incident and related incidents;

Whereas, while the PRC has a long history of intelligence collection operations against national security entities of the United States, reports of its espionage have risen significantly in the past decade;

Whereas the Chinese Communist Party spread false claims about the nature and purpose of the surveillance balloon, falsely claiming it to be a weather balloon that veered off course due to "force majeure";

Whereas, on February 3, 2023, the Secretary of State postponed his trip to the PRC and referred to the balloon incident as an "irresponsible act and a clear violation of U.S. sovereignty and international law that undermined the purpose of the trip";

Whereas Article I of the Convention on International Civil Aviation, also known as the Chicago Convention, states that "every State has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory";

Whereas the substantial increase in the detection of unidentified aerial phenomena since February 4, 2023 warrants further investigation and attention to domain awareness gaps identified by United States Northern Command; and

Whereas it is in the national security interest of the United States to deter foreign adversaries from engaging in intelligence collection and other malign activities within United States territory and airspace: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the brazen violation of United States sovereignty by the People's Republic of China (PRC);

(2) denounces the efforts of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) to deceive the international community through false claims about its intelligence collection campaigns in violation of United States sovereignty, and those regarding other nations where similar incidents have occurred;

(3) determines that it should be the policy of the United States to act promptly, responsibly, and decisively to deter and stop foreign aerial surveillance platforms violating United States sovereignty, including those directed by or connected to the CCP; and

(4) calls on the President to keep Congress fully informed by continuing to provide comprehensive briefings on the February 2023 incident, previous incidents, and the broader efforts of the PRC in this area that include—

(A) a complete account of all known violations of United States national airspace by the PRC in recent years, regardless of platform;

(B) a complete account of similar past incidents of the PRC's use of surveillance balloons around the world;

(C) a timeline of events for the February 2023 incident, from first detection to the eventual shutdown of the balloon;

(D) an assessment of what surveillance data the PRC was potentially able to collect or transmit via the balloon while it was over United States territory;

(E) an assessment of the value of the intelligence that the United States obtained while the balloon transited the United States and from the recovery and analysis of physical debris;

(F) a detailed account of what measures were taken to mitigate the intelligence collection threat posed by the balloon, the costs of those measures, and the impact on the regular operations of the affected installations, platforms, and personnel;

(G) a description of what options were identified to mitigate the threat, and a description and timing of the recommendations the United States military made regarding those options;

(H) an account of diplomatic communications, past and ongoing, between the United States and the PRC regarding the February 2023 incident, including any demarches by Department of State personnel and subsequent responses by the PRC;

(I) a detailed description of plans, capabilities, and methods to deter and defeat intelligence collection activities conducted by the PRC or other foreign adversaries in United States national airspace and any additional authorities or resources needed from Congress to ensure detection and defeat of these activities in the future;

(J) a detailed description of efforts of the United States to enhance cooperation with partners, allies, and countries affected by the global surveillance balloon program of the PRC to push back on the PRC's practices in this area; and

(K) a description of efforts to hold the Government of the PRC, and entities associated with the design, development, management, and deployment of the PRC surveillance balloon program, accountable for the violation of United States sovereignty and the sovereignty of other countries.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 67—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF "CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH"**

Mr. KAINÉ (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BUDD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VANCE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 67

Whereas a competitive global economy requires workers who are prepared for skilled professions;

Whereas not fewer than 17,000,000 new workers will be needed to support the infrastructure sector of the United States in the next decade, including to design, build, and operate transportation, housing, utilities, and telecommunications;

Whereas current global economic uncertainty and volatility have fundamentally shifted entire industries within foundational sectors of the economy of the United States, creating significant demands for high-quality and efficient educational opportunities to ensure a quick and equitable recovery;

Whereas career and technical education (referred to in this preamble as "CTE") ensures that competitive and skilled workers are ready, willing, and capable of holding jobs in high-wage, high-skill, and in-demand career fields such as science, technology, engineering, art and design, mathematics,

nursing, allied health, construction, information technology, energy sustainability, and many other career fields that are vital in keeping the United States competitive in the global economy;

Whereas CTE helps the United States meet the very real and immediate challenges of economic development, student achievement, and global competitiveness;

Whereas, in the United States, more than ½ of all jobs require some level of postsecondary education, but less than a bachelor's degree;

Whereas nearly 12,000,000 students are enrolled in CTE across the United States at the secondary and postsecondary levels, with CTE programs in thousands of comprehensive high schools, area technical centers, and career academies and in nearly 1,000 2-year colleges;

Whereas CTE matches employability skills with workforce demand and provides relevant academic and technical coursework leading to credentials of value for secondary, postsecondary, and adult learners;

Whereas CTE affords students the opportunity to cultivate the knowledge and skills to earn the credentials needed to secure careers in growing, high-demand fields;

Whereas secondary CTE is associated with a lower probability of dropping out of high school and a higher likelihood of graduating on time;

Whereas, according to an American Federation of Teachers poll, 94 percent of parents approve of expanding access to CTE and other programs that prepare students for jobs;

Whereas students at schools with highly-integrated, rigorous academic and CTE programs are significantly more likely to meet college and career readiness benchmarks than students at schools with less integrated programs;

Whereas, in 2018, Congress affirmed the importance of CTE by passing the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act (Public Law 115-224; 132 Stat. 1563), which supports investment and program improvement in secondary and postsecondary CTE programs in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, and outlying areas; and

Whereas February 23, 2023, marks the 106th anniversary of the signing of the Act of February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, commonly known as the "Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act of 1917"), which was the first major Federal investment in secondary CTE and laid the foundation for the bipartisan, bicameral support for CTE that continues as of February 2023: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of February 2023 as "Career and Technical Education Month" to celebrate career and technical education across the United States;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month;

(3) recognizes the importance of career and technical education in preparing a well-educated and skilled workforce in the United States; and

(4) encourages educators, school counselors, guidance and career development professionals, administrators, and parents to promote career and technical education as a respected educational pathway for students.

SENATE RESOLUTION 68—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 11 THROUGH FEBRUARY 18, 2023, AS "NATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP WEEK" TO RECOGNIZE THE IMPORTANCE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF ENTREPRENEURS AND STARTUPS TO THE ECONOMIC PROSPERITY OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE WELL-BEING OF EVERY COMMUNITY ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 68

Whereas National Entrepreneurship Week is a congressionally chartered event taking place annually during the third week of February for the purpose of democratizing and promoting entrepreneurship across the United States through education, connection, and collaboration;

Whereas the United States is the most entrepreneurial country in the world and the entrepreneurial spirit woven into the national consciousness is central to the identity of the United States;

Whereas that entrepreneurial spirit and the countless new businesses it has spawned have built the most innovative and productive economy in the history of the world;

Whereas the United States is a nation of entrepreneurs, with new and small businesses comprising 99 percent of all businesses in the United States and employing nearly half of all workers in the United States;

Whereas, given the importance of entrepreneurship to innovation, productivity gains, job creation, and expanding opportunity, a thriving entrepreneurial spirit is critical to economic growth in the United States;

Whereas National Entrepreneurship Week celebrates the initiative, drive, creativity, and commitment embodied in the entrepreneurial spirit of the United States;

Whereas National Entrepreneurship Week inspires students and the next generation of entrepreneurs by encouraging educators in grade schools, colleges, and universities across the United States to integrate entrepreneurship education into the classroom; and

Whereas research has demonstrated that students who participate in entrepreneurship education programs have better attendance records, perform better in core subjects, and have lower drop-out rates than students who do not participate in such programs: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of February 11 through February 18, 2023, as "National Entrepreneurship Week";

(2) celebrates the importance of entrepreneurs and startups to the economy of the United States;

(3) recognizes the contributions entrepreneurs make to expand opportunity, provide more inclusive prosperity, and increase the well-being of every community across the United States;

(4) affirms the importance and urgency of enacting policies that promote, nurture, and support entrepreneurs and startups; and

(5) encourages Federal, State, and local governments, schools, nonprofit organizations, and other civic organizations to observe National Entrepreneurship Week annually with special events and activities—

(A) to recognize the contributions of entrepreneurs in the United States;

(B) to teach the importance of entrepreneurship to a strong and inclusive economy; and

(C) to take steps to encourage, support, and celebrate future entrepreneurs.

SENATE RESOLUTION 69—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 18 THROUGH FEBRUARY 25, 2023, AS "NATIONAL FFA WEEK", RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF THE NATIONAL FFA ORGANIZATION IN DEVELOPING THE NEXT GENERATION OF GLOBALLY CONSCIOUS LEADERS WHO WILL CHANGE THE WORLD AND IN CELEBRATION OF THE 95TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL FFA ORGANIZATION

Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. VANCE, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. KELLY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 69

Whereas the National FFA Organization (referred to in this preamble as the "FFA") was established in 1928;

Whereas the mission of the FFA is to make a positive difference in the lives of students by developing their potential for premier leadership, personal growth, and career success through agricultural education;

Whereas the FFA has more than 850,000 members in 8,995 chapters in all 50 States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, and Washington, D.C.;

Whereas the FFA welcomes all students;

Whereas more than 13,000 FFA advisors and agricultural education teachers deliver an integrated model of agricultural education, providing students with an innovative and cutting-edge education;

Whereas the FFA facilitates formative experiences, altering the course of the lives of students for the better;

Whereas FFA members develop the necessary career-readiness skills to continue their education in college or to enter the workforce immediately;

Whereas the FFA prepares members to be globally conscious citizens of their communities, their States, their country, and the world;

Whereas the FFA provides opportunities to demonstrate literacy, advocacy, and technical skills in agriculture, food, and natural resources;

Whereas the origin of the blue FFA jacket dates back to 1933, when it was created by the Universal Uniform Company in Fredericktown, Ohio;

Whereas the FFA jacket debuted at the 1933 National FFA Convention and was so popular that the official delegates of the convention made the jacket part of the official FFA attire;

Whereas the 1,000,000th FFA jacket was sold in 1964, and by 1976, 2,000,000 FFA jackets had been sold;

Whereas 80,000 FFA jackets are sold annually; and

Whereas members of the FFA will celebrate "National FFA Week" during the week of February 18 through February 25, 2023: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of February 18 through February 25, 2023, as "National FFA Week";

(2) recognizes the important role of the National FFA Organization in developing the next generation of globally conscious leaders who will change the world; and

(3) celebrates the 95th anniversary of the National FFA Organization.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 70—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF FEBRUARY 1, 2023, AS "GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER DAY"

Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. WARNOCK) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

##### S. RES. 70

Whereas George Washington Carver was one of the greatest agricultural scientists and humanitarians in the United States in the 20th century;

Whereas George Washington Carver was born enslaved in Missouri circa 1864 and eventually pursued higher education at Simpson College in Iowa;

Whereas George Washington Carver was the first Black student and first Black faculty member at Iowa State University and later earned international renown at Tuskegee University in Alabama where he served as a faculty member for more than 45 years and as Agricultural Director;

Whereas George Washington Carver gained an international reputation for his research, teaching, and outreach and created hundreds of agricultural products, including new varieties of peanuts, soybeans, sweet potatoes, and other crops; and

Whereas the humanitarian efforts of George Washington Carver changed the lives of countless farmers and families in poverty: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate supports the designation of February 1, 2023, as "George Washington Carver Day" to celebrate and commemorate the enduring legacy and contributions of George Washington Carver to the United States.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I have eight requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are au-

thorized to meet during today session of the Senate:

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 15, 2023, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 15, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 15, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 15, 2023, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 15, 2023, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 15, 2023, at 12 p.m.

##### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 15, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 15, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

#### EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY'S ESPIONAGE MISSION TO SEND A SURVEILLANCE BALLOON ACROSS THE UNITED STATES, IN VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, IS UNACCEPTABLE AND SHOULD BE CONDEMNED

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration and that the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 49) expressing the sense of the Senate that the Chinese Com-

munist Party's espionage mission to send a surveillance balloon across the United States, in violation of international law, is unacceptable and should be condemned.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 9, 2023, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### CONDEMNING THE USE BY THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA OF A HIGH-ALTITUDE SURVEILLANCE BALLOON OVER THE TERRITORY OF THE UNITED STATES AS A BRAZEN VIOLATION OF UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 66, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 66) condemning the use by the People's Republic of China of a high-altitude surveillance balloon over the territory of the United States as a brazen violation of United States sovereignty.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 66) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions introduced earlier today: S. Res. 67, S. Res. 68, S. Res. 69, and S. Res. 70.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions (S. Res. 67, S. Res. 68, S. Res. 69, and S. Res. 70) were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

**AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE FOR THE PERIODS MARCH 1, 2023, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2023, OCTOBER 1, 2023, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2024, AND OCTOBER 1, 2024, THROUGH FEBRUARY 28, 2025**

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 15, S. Res. 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 59) authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods March 1, 2023, through September 30, 2023, October 1, 2023, through September 30, 2024, and October 1, 2024, through February 28, 2025.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint leadership letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**JOINT LEADERSHIP LETTER AND COLLOQUY**

The Joint Leadership Letter and Colloquy of February 15, 2023, stated the following with regard to the division of funding and office space for the majority and minority.

**JOINT LEADERSHIP LETTER**

We mutually commit to the following for the 118th Congress: The Committee on Rules and Administration is to determine the budgets of the committees of the Senate. The budgets of the committees, including joint and special committees, and all other subgroups, shall be apportioned to reflect the ratio of the Senate as of this date, including an additional ten percent (10%) from the majority and minority salary baseline to be allocated to the chair for administrative expenses.

Special Reserves has been restored to its historic purpose. Requests for funding will only be considered when submitted by a committee chairman and ranking member for

unanticipated, nonrecurring needs. Such requests shall be granted only upon the approval of the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Funds for committee expenses shall be available to each chairman consistent with the Senate rules and practices.

The division of committee office space shall be commensurate with this funding agreement. The chairman and ranking member of any committee may, by mutual agreement, modify the apportionment of committee funding and office space.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in the 112th Congress, the Senate adopted a new funding allocation for Senate committees. This approach has served the Senate well for the five of the past six Congresses, excluding last Congress when the evenly divided Senate adopted a power-sharing agreement by resolution. I believe this approach will continue to serve the interests of the Senate and the public, regardless of which party is in the majority, by helping to retain core committee staff with institutional knowledge. This funding allocation is based on the party division of the Senate, with 10 percent of the total majority and minority salary baseline going to the majority for administrative expenses. However, regardless of the party division of the Senate, the minority share of the majority and minority salary baseline will never be less than 40 percent, and the majority share will not exceed 60 percent. It is my intent that this approach will continue to serve the Senate for this Congress and future Congresses.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this approach has met our needs for five of the past six Congresses, and I, too, would like to see it continue. In addition, special reserves have been restored to its historic purpose. We should continue to fund special reserves to the extent possible in order to be able to assist committees that face urgent, unanticipated, nonrecurring needs. Recognizing the tight budgets we will face for the foreseeable future, it is necessary to continue to bring funding authorizations more in line with our actual resources while ensuring that committees are able to fulfill their responsibilities. I look forward to continuing to work with the majority leader to accomplish this.

Ms. CANTWELL. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 59) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in the RECORD of February 13, 2023, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

**ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2023**

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, February 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Martinez-Lopez nomination postcloture; further, that if any nominations are confirmed during Thursday's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be two rollcall votes at 11:30 a.m. and one rollcall vote at 1:45 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW**

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:19 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 16, 2023, at 10 a.m.

**CONFIRMATIONS**

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 15, 2023:

**THE JUDICIARY**

ANA C. REYES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

ADRIENNE C. NELSON, OF OREGON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON.